

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF THE GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.

Monday, the 2nd November 1931.

The House met at eleven of the clock, Mr. President (the hon. Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI) in the Chair.

PRESENT:

- | | |
|---|---|
| Usman Sahib Bahadur, <i>Kt.</i> , The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed. | Moses, Mr. P. C. |
| Krishnan Nayar, <i>Kt.</i> , The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. | Muniswami Pillai, Rao Sahib V. I. |
| Campbell, C.S.I., C.I.E., C.B.E., V.D., I.C.S., The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. | Muthiah Chettiyar, Mr. M. A. |
| Stokes, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., The hon. Mr. H. G. | Muthu Chettiyar, Mr. P. C. |
| Muniswami Nayudu, The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. | Nachiyappa Goundar, M. K. A. |
| Rajan, The hon. Mr. P. T. | Nanjappa Bahadur, Subadar-Major S. A. |
| Kumaraswami Reddiyar, The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. | Narasa Reddi, Mr. T. |
| Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur. | Narasimhaswami, Mr. D. V. |
| Ahmed Meeran Sahib Bahadur. | Narayanan Nambiyar, Mr. V. P. |
| Alamelumanga Thayaramma, Mrs. K. | Natesa Mudaliyar, Rao Bahadur C. |
| Arasu, Mr. V. T. | Palat, Mr. R. M. |
| Ari Gowder, Mr. H. B. | Patnaik Mahasayo, Sriman M. G. |
| Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur R. N. | Pattagar of Palayakottai, The |
| Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur. | Pocker Sahib Bahadur, B. |
| Basu Dev, Mr. C. | Premayya, Mr. G. R. |
| Bayappa Reddi, Mr. P. | Rajagopala Pillai, Mr. P. V. |
| Birley, Mr. F. | Raja of Kallikote, The |
| Browning, Mr. W. M. | Ramachandra Padayachi, Mr. P. K. |
| Conran Smith, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. E. | Ramakrishna Reddi, Mr. A. |
| Devadasan, Mr. M. | Ramalingam Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur T. A. |
| Dharmalingam Pillai, Rao Sahib V. | Ramamurti, Pandit Ganala. |
| Duraiswami Reddiyar, Mr. K. M. | Ramamurti, I.C.S., Mr. S. V. |
| Ellappa Chettiyar, Diwan Bahadur S. | Raman Menon, Mr. K. P. |
| Foulkes, Mr. R. | Ramaswami Ayyar, Mr. T. S. |
| Hood, I.C.S., Mr. H. M. | Ramaswami Mudaliyar, Mr. V. M. |
| Indrayya, Mr. C. | Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. G. |
| Jagannatham, Mr. H. M. | Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur C. S. |
| James, Mr. F. E. | Sahajanandam, Swami A. S. |
| Jayaram Nayudu, Rao Sahib C. | Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, Mr. |
| Koti Reddi, Mr. K. | Satyanarayana Choudari, Mr. C. |
| Krishnan, Mr. C. | Sesha Reddi, Mr. B. P. |
| Kuppuswami Choudari, Mr. J. | Shetty, Mr. A. B. |
| Luker, Mr. F. G. | Singam Ayyangar, Mr. K. |
| Madanagopal Nayudu, Mr. R. | Siva Raj, Mr. N. |
| Madhusoodhanan Tangal, Mr. P. | Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar, Mr. K. S. |
| Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur. | Soundara Pandiyan, Mr. W. P. A. |
| Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur. | Sreshtha, Mr. M. S. |
| Manikkavelu Nayakar, Mr. M. A. | Sriramulu, Mr. G. |
| Moidoo Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur, T. M. | Subbarayan, Dr. P. |
| | Subrahmanya Chetti, Rao Sahib P. |
| | Subrahmanya Bhatt, Mr. U. C. |
| | Sundara Rao Nayudu, Mr. T. |
| | Syed Tajudin Sahib Bahadur, Khan Sahib. |

[2nd November 1931]

PRESENT—cont.

Thorne, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. J. A.
 Tottenham, I.C.S., Mr. G. R. F.
 Vasudeva Pillai, Mr. V. G.
 Vedachala Mudaliyar, Mr. M.
 Venkatachala Reddiyar, Mr. K. C. M.
 Venkatarama Ayyar, Mr. K. R.
 Venkataramayya, Rao Sahib Badeti.

Venugopal Nayudu, Rao Bahadur R. K.
 Winter, Mr. W. E.
 Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.
 Yakub Hasan Sahib Bahadur.
 Zamindar of Kirlampudi, The
 Zamindar of Mirzapuram, The

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS

Criminal Settlements

Transfer of the Kavali and Bitragunta criminal settlements to the Police department.

*451 Q.—Khan Bahadur YAHYA ALI SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have considered the advisability of handing over the Kavali and Bitragunta Criminal Settlements to the Police department as a measure of retrenchment; and

(b) if so, with what results?

A.—(a) & (b) The matter is under the consideration of Government.

Depressed Classes

Working of societies formed for the acquisition of house-sites for depressed classes.

* 452 Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) the societies formed up to date for the acquisition of house-sites for the benefit of the depressed classes, the total amount advanced to such societies and the amounts out of it written off, collected and overdue respectively; and

(b) the staff employed on this particular branch of work, their annual cost to Government and the average amount realized annually by the Government through their agency?

A.—(a) & (b) The statement below gives the information:—

(1) Number of Co-operative Societies
 formed up to 31st March 1931. 634

RS.

(2) Total amount advanced	...	...	8,57,772
(3) Amount written off	...	...	10,030
(4) Amount collected	...	...	6,23,718
(5) Amount overdue	...	...	21,342

2nd November 1931]

(6) Details of staff employed	... * 28 Co-operative Inspectors.
	RS.
(7) Annual cost	33,791
(8) Average amount realized annually.	59,127

Labour

Transfer of Labour institutions to non-official bodies.

* 453 Q.—MR. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether the question of transferring the management of institutions now conducted by the Labour department to non-official bodies as a measure of retrenchment is before the Government; and, if so, what the decision of the Government is in the matter?

A.—No such question is under the consideration of Government as a measure of retrenchment. A proposal to transfer certain Labour department schools to the management of local boards is under consideration.

MR. A. B. SHETTY:—“Sir, the answer says that there is a proposal to transfer certain Labour department schools to the management of the local boards. May I know in which district or districts this proposal will be given effect to?”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—
“In all districts where the Labour department is working.”

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—“May I know if this proposal originated from the Retrenchment Committee?”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—“I think, from the Commissioner of Labour.”

General

Circular by the Tahsildar of Chandragiri regarding Congress activities.

* 454 Q.—MR. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that a circular (herewith annexed) was issued by the Tahsildar of Chandragiri to the karnams and village magistrates in Chittoor district;

(b) whether it is a fact that the said order was issued by the Tahsildar of Chandragiri, under the orders of the Collector, and if so, why;

(c) what are the facts on which the said order was issued;

a These Inspectors are also in charge of the other Co-operative Societies for the depressed classes in the area.

[2nd November 1931]

(d) whether it is a fact that the circular was withdrawn by the Collector of Chittoor;

(e) whether it is a fact that the Government made an enquiry into the matter of the emergent order; and

(f) whether it is a fact that the said emergent order was cancelled and, if so, why and under what circumstances?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to clauses (a), (b) & (c) of his question No. 436.

(d) The Tahsildar's circular was withdrawn under the instructions of the Collector.

(e) On the circular coming to their notice the Government called for a report of the circumstances in which it was issued.

(f) The circular^a was withdrawn under the instructions of the Collector as being unauthorized, as soon as it came to his notice.

Alleged order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, by the District Magistrate, Chittoor, against certain vakils.

* 455 Q.—MR. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that an order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, was passed on 12th July 1931, against certain vakils of Chittoor, for having started picketing in the Kattumanchi toddy shop;

(b) whether the District Collector passed an order under section 144, after issuing a notice to them;

(c) whether the Government will lay the text of the order on the table of the House;

(d) whether there were any instructions given by the District Magistrate to the vakils for picketing, and if so, what they are;

(e) whether the District Collector passed an order prohibiting all people from picketing within a radius of five miles from Chittoor, and if so, why; and

(f) whether there was an order passed by the District Magistrate or the Sub-Magistrate of Chittoor, at his direction?

A.—(a), (b), (c) & (e) The hon. Member is referred to the order, dated 12th July 1931, which was passed by the Sub-Magistrate of Chittoor and not by the District Magistrate. A copy^b of it is placed on the table.

(d) The Government have no information.

(f) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to clause (a) of question No. 449.

^a Printed as Appendix I on page 456 infra.

^b Printed as Appendix II on pages 456-457 infra.

2nd November 1931]

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" With reference to the answer to clause (d) of this question, may I know whether the Government made enquiries to ascertain whether such instructions were issued?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—" I do not think the Government made any enquiries."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" In view of the fact that there was this question asking for information, may I know why the Government did not make enquiries?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—" It was not thought that any enquiry was needed."

Alleged ill-treatment of the Adi-Dravidas of the villages of Koothapal and Krishnasamudram by the caste Hindus.

* 456 Q.—Mr. H. M. JAGANNATHAM: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that in the last week of June 1931 an attempt was made by caste Hindus in the villages of Koothapal and Krishnasamudram, Trichinopoly district, to coerce the Adi-Dravidas of the places to sign a declaration to the effect that they would wear clothes only above the knee, use no vessels except those made of clay, abstain from sending their children to schools, and not wear any jewellery made of gold or silver;

(b) whether his attention has been drawn to the further fact that owing to the refusal of the Adi-Dravidas to sign the above declaration, the caste Hindus molested a large number of them, causing injuries to some, who had to be treated in the hospitals;

(c) what steps were taken by the local police authorities to bring the offenders to book and afford relief to the beaten Adi-Dravidas; and

(d) whether the Government will be pleased to appoint a court of enquiry to investigate this matter?

A.—(a) & (b) As the riot which occurred at Koothapal on the 17th June 1931, between caste Hindus and Adi-Dravidas is the subject of criminal case pending before the Sub-divisional Magistrate, Trichinopoly, the Government are unable to answer the question in detail at present.

(c) Thirty-eight persons have been charged by the police and the trial is proceeding.

(d) The matter is already under judicial enquiry.

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—" May I know when the trial actually started in this case?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—

" I must ask for notice of the question."

[2nd November 1931]

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—" May I ask the hon. Member, Sir, whether the Government are aware that the Adi-Dravidas feel that there will be a certain amount of miscarriage of justice on account of the long delay in the matter? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—

" The Government have absolutley no such apprehension."

Civil Justice

Construction of an overbridge to connect the Small Causes Court buildings with the High Court buildings.

* 457 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the original estimates for the new Small Causes Court buildings provided for any overbridge connecting the new buildings with the present High Court buildings;

(b) if not, why this was omitted from the estimates and who is responsible for the same;

(c) whether any representations have been made to the hon. the Law Member, officially as to the necessity of an overbridge connecting the said two buildings; and

(d) whether the Government have examined the question of the approximate cost of an overbridge connecting the present High Court buildings and the new Small Causes Court buildings?

A.—(a) No.

(b) It was not thought necessary to provide an overbridge.

(c) & (d) No.

Comparative statement of suits and appeals instituted in the High Court and the Subordinate Civil Courts.

* 458 Q.—Rao Sahib B. VENKATARAMAYYA: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state whether the Government will be pleased to call for a comparative statement of suits and appeals instituted in the High Court and in the Subordinate Civil Courts in the Presidency for two months after the summer recess during the years 1929, 1930 and 1931?

A.—A statement ^a is laid on the table.

Receipts and expenditure of the District Munsif's Court at Palamcottah.

* 459 Q.—Mr. M. DEVADASAN: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) what is the total receipt of income in the shape of Court-fees in each of the years 1928, 1929 and 1930 in the District Munsif's Court, Palamcottah;

2nd November 1931]

- (b) what is the total expenditure of the court per year;
- (c) what is the total income and expenditure of the court of the District Munsif, Ambasamudram, in 1930; and
- (d) whether there has been any protest made against the abolition of the Palamcottah District Munsif's Court, both by the bar and the litigant public?

A.—(a)—

				RS.	A.	P.
1928	...	...	...	28,717	1	0
1929	...	...	...	26,105	4	0
1930	...	...	...	31,254	8	0
(b)—						
1928	...	...	...	8,473	3	7
1929	...	...	...	9,355	4	2
1930	...	...	...	9,526	8	7

(c)—

<i>Income</i>			<i>Expenditure.</i>		
RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.
45,080	11	0	22,649	15	0

(d) Yes.

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—" May I know, Sir, in view of the fact that the income from the District Munsif's Court, Palamcottah, in 1930, was Rs. 31,254 and the expenditure during the period was only Rs. 9,256, whether the Government do not think that the Court should be allowed to continue? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. RISHNAN NAYAR:—" No, Sir."

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—" May I ask whether the Government are aware that there was an increase of Rs. 5,000 in the income from court-fees in the year 1930? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" Is it in addition to what is stated here? "

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—" Yes."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" The Government are not aware of it."

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—" Sir, my question is this: in 1929 the income of the Court was Rs. 26,105-4-0 and it rose in 1930 to Rs. 31,254-8-0. So there is an increase of Rs. 5,000 in the shape of court-fees."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" It is patent from the figures."

Expenditure and income of the Sub-Court at Chittoor.

* 460 Q.—Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have scrutinized the statistics of pending work in the Sub-Court at Chittoor, and examined whether its existence is necessary; and

[2nd November 1931]

(b) what have been the cost of running the Sub-Court at Chittoor and the income derived by way of court-fees since 1st July last? "

A.—(a) No.

(b) The Government have not the information.

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR:—" May I know whether the Government will be pleased to call for the information when there is a proposal to abolish one of the courts either in Chittoor or in Vellore? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" There is no such proposal before the Government and therefore there is no need for any enquiry."

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR:—" Before the High Court? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" I am not aware of it."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" Will the Government be pleased to call for the information from the High Court? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" If the High Court have any such proposal, they will send it up to the Government."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" Are we to understand that there is no such proposal before the High Court? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" We are not to understand anything."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I know, Sir, whether any representation has been made to the hon. Member about the non-desirability of abolishing the Vellore District Court? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" I received certain telegrams to the effect that the Vellore District Court should be retained and I told the persons concerned that there was no proposal before the Government to abolish the Vellore District Court."

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR:—" May I ask the hon. Member whether the statistics in Chittoor and Vellore will be thoroughly examined before any such proposal is entertained? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" I am sure the High Court will do it."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" After the matter has passed the stage of consideration by the High Court, will the Government consider the desirability of examining the relevant statistics before passing final orders? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" The High Court can be expected to do all that."

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR:—" May I ask whether the Government will accept the proposal because the High Court might be recommending it? "

2nd November 1931]

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"That will depend upon the strength of the recommendation of the High Court and the state of statistics."

Expenditure and income of the District Court, Chittoor.

* 461 Q.—Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have scrutinized the statistics of pending work in the District Judge's Court at Chittoor, and examined whether its existence is necessary; and

(b) what have been the cost of running the District Judge's Court at Chittoor and the income derived by way of court-fees since 1st July last?

A.—(a) No.

(b) The Government have not the information.

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask whether information regarding the cost of running the District Judge's Court at Chittoor, cannot be collected?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"As I stated, the High Court will forward all that information to the Government if and when they send their proposal."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"When information is desired by hon. Members of this House, will the Government not call for it?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"There is no need for it now."

Proposed abolition of either the District Court of Chittoor or North Arcot.

* 462 Q.—Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal either with the Government or the High Court to abolish either the District Court of Chittoor or that of North Arcot;

(b) whether the respective District Judges were consulted in the matter; and

(c) whether statistics about the civil and criminal work in the respective District Courts were called for and examined?

A.—(a) There is no such proposal before the Government and they have no information whether any proposal of the kind is now before the High Court.

(b) & (c) Do not arise.

[2nd November 1931]

Inclusion of the Sholinghur District Munsif's Court, under the appellate jurisdiction of the District Court, North Arcot.

* 463 Q.—Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Sholinghur Munsif's Court was recently included in Chittoor District Court's jurisdiction;

(b) whether the revenue and criminal work of the area over which that court has jurisdiction is still within the jurisdiction of the North Arcot Collector and District Magistrate; and

(c) whether there is a proposal to include the Sholinghur Munsif's Court within the jurisdiction of the North Arcot District Court?

A.—(a) No.

(b) A portion of the area is within the jurisdiction of the Collector and District Magistrate of North Arcot.

(c) No.

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—“ May I ask whether there is any parallel to this case where a certain territory is included for revenue purposes under one district and for judicial purposes under another district? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“ Notice.”

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR:—“ May I know whether it is not the policy of the Government to proceed on linguistic lines as far as possible? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“ The determination of the jurisdiction of Munsifs' Courts is primarily the duty of the High Court.”

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR:—“ Do the Government not think that it is an anomaly and that it should be remedied? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“ The Government do not think so.”

Suits and appeals arising from the territorial jurisdiction of the Sholinghur District Munsif filed in the Court at Chittoor.

* 464 Q.—Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that suits and appeals arising in North Arcot within the jurisdiction of the Sholinghur munsif are being filed in the Court at Chittoor;

(b) whether the Government will be pleased to state how many such suits and appeals have been filed in the Chittoor courts after the opening of the Sub-Court and District Court at Vellore; and

(c) whether the Government will be pleased to state the reason why such an arrangement by which suits and appeals of one district are tried in another district is followed?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) & (c) The Government have called for the information.

2nd November 1931]

Additional District Munsif's Courts for Kasaragod and Ongole.

* 465 Q.—Khan Bahadur MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether Additional District Munsifs' Courts were sanctioned for Kasaragod and Ongole;

(b) if so, why these courts have not been opened; and

(c) what is the pendency in these courts now?

A.—(a) & (b) No Additional District Munsif's Court was sanctioned either for Kasaragod or Ongole. But provision was made in the budget for the current year for the appointments of Additional District Munsifs to the District Munsifs' courts of Kasaragod and Ongole for six months each during the current year. The appointment of Additional District Munsif, Ongole, was sanctioned with effect from 1st July 1931 and that of Kasaragod was dropped in view of the present financial stringency. The Additional District Munsif, Ongole, is now working.

(c) The Government have no information.

Khan Bahadur MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur:—“With reference to the answer to clause (c) of this question, may I know whether the Government will call for the information and satisfy themselves that the pendency is more in Kasaragod than in Ongole?”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“I shall call for the information.”

Forests

Forest Kancha system in the Nellore district.

* 466 Q.—Khan Bahadur YAHYA ALI SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that Forest Kancha system is peculiar to Nellore district only;

(b) whether its working has been satisfactory; and

(c) whether the Government will be pleased to call for a detailed report on this from the District Collector?

A.—(a) The system is largely followed only in that district.

(b) & (c) A report has been called for from the Chief Conservator of Forests.

Panchayat Courts

Supersession of the Panchayat Court of Purasai village, North Arcot district.

* 467 Q.—Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Panchayat Court of Purasai village in the North Arcot district has been superseded;

[2nd November 1931]

(b) if so, who is administering the functions of the Panchayat Court; and

(c) whether representations have been made against his being so appointed on the ground of his being the leader of a faction?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The civil functions of the superseded Panchayat Court are exercised by the village munsif appointed under section 7 of the Madras Village Courts Act, 1888, and its criminal functions by the Sub-Magistrate, Cheyyar.

(c) No representations have been received by Government.

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—“ With reference to clause (b) of the answer, may I ask whether the Government will not take steps to reconstitute the panchayat court under the Panchayat Act? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“ No, Sir.”

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—“ May I know the reason for not reconstituting it, Sir? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“ Because the District Magistrate has reported that, on account of the existence of factions there, the panchayat court is not working satisfactorily.”

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—“ May I ask the hon. Member whether the Government cannot give the right to elect the members of the Panchayat Court to a faction which can command confidence? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“ Having regard to the District Magistrate's report, the answer is in the negative.”

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—“ May I know what the strength of the factions is? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“ Notice.”

Forest Panchayats

Assignment of a portion of land forming the Ramiampatti reserve to cultivating ryots.

* 463 Q.—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the people of Remenahalli, Budanatham, etc., villages in Harur taluk of Salem district have petitioned to Government requesting them to throw open the Ramiampatti reserve forest under the control of the forest panchayat of that place, and assign the fertile portions of the land to the poor ryots;

(b) if so, what action the Government have taken and how the matter was finally disposed of;

(c) whether it is a fact that that forest area was once cultivable patta lands in or about the fasli 1281; and

(d) if so, what objections there exist to assigning the land now?

2nd November 1931]

A.—(a) & (b) A petition from ryots of Remenahalli and other villages, dated 4th November 1929, containing a request for the disreservation and assignment of 1,500 acres of land in Mekalnayakanahalli village, under the management of Remanahalli Forest Panchayat was transferred to the Board of Revenue for disposal.

(c) & (d) The Government have not the information.

Alleged refusal of grazing facilities by the Kallapadi Forest Panchayat, North Arcot district.

* 469 Q.—MR. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether he is aware that the Kallapadi Forest Panchayat in the North Arcot district has neither been permitting the neighbouring villagers of Pasumathur, Vepur, Kavanur, Amanan Kuppam from taking their usual supply of leaf manure from the forest range nor allowing their cattle to graze there;

(b) whether there is any other forest range of a like nature available to the peasants of the said villages; and

(c) what steps he proposes to take to remedy these grievances?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have not the information. They have called for it.

(c) This question will be considered when the information is received.

Irrigation

Extent of the ayacut under the Kannambadi dam.

* 470 Q.—MR. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) what is the total of ayacut irrigated under the Kannambadi dam in the British territory;

(b) how is this total extent distributed among the districts of Tanjore, South Arcot and Trichinopoly;

(c) what is the area that is fixed for each of the said districts and when it was fixed;

(d) whether there is any understanding or agreement between this Government and the Mysore State with regard to the total extent of British land to be irrigated under the Kannambadi dam apart from the award of 1929; and

(e) if so whether a copy of such agreement will be placed on the table of the House?

A.—(a) There is no ayacut irrigated under the Kannambadi dam in British territory.

(b) to (e) Do not arise.

[2nd November 1931]

Return of the public records connected with the arbitration of the Kannambadi dam.

* 471 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether he has made enquiries as to the return of the public records sent to the Chief Engineer's office by the Superintending Engineer's office of Tanjore as promised in answer to question No. 142 on 5th August 1931; and

(b) if so, whether orders have been issued for return of the said public records and whether the said public records have been actually returned?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) All the records obtained from the subordinate offices for the purpose of the Arbitration of 1929 have been returned to them.

Estimate for the construction of a syphon over the Morattu channel, Chidambaram taluk.

* 472 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) when the estimate for the construction of the syphon over the Morattu channel, Vayalamur village, Chidambaram taluk, South Arcot district, was sanctioned and what is the estimated cost;

(b) whether tenders have been called for the construction of the said syphon and whether the same have been approved by the Government;

(c) when the construction will be commenced and completed;

(d) whether the ryots who waited on the Collector of South Arcot on deputation on 7th September 1931, complained against the delay in the carrying out of the syphon work; and

(e) what the reason for the delay is and what action the Government propose to take to avoid further delay and loss to the ryots?

A.—(a) In January 1931; Rs. 2,550.

(b) The Government have no information whether tenders were called for; such tenders do not require the approval of Government.

(c) & (e) The work has been postponed owing to the present financial stringency.

(d) The Government have no information.

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I ask, Sir, in view of the fact that the estimated cost of the work is only Rs. 2,550 and in view of the admitted fact that the lands are submerged in that area for want of this work, whether the Government cannot sanction the carrying out of the work now? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—" I am afraid we cannot sanction it. We have no money."

2nd November 1931]

• Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Not even an estimate for Rs. 2,550."

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"No, Sir."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"When you collect revenue from lands, is it not your duty to find money for giving them the necessary protection?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"We cannot do it now."

Resolutions passed by the Sethiathope Mirasidars' Association and the Chidambaram Taluk Mirasidars' Association.

* 473 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received a copy of the resolutions passed by the Sethiathope Ancient Mirasidars' Association held on 26th August 1931 and of the Chidambaram Taluk Mirasidars' Association on 26th September 1931; and

(b) if so, what action the Government have taken or propose to take with reference to the said resolutions and representations of the mirasidars to redress their grievances?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The Associations have been informed that the Government will receive a deputation from the Associations.

Report from the Chief Engineer on special duty, Vellar Investigating Party.

* 474 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state whether a copy of G.O. No. 944 I., dated 1st September 1906, will be placed on the table and also a copy of the appendices referred to in the report No. 377, dated 12th April 1905, from the Chief Engineer on special duty, Vellar Investigating Party, to the Chief Engineer, Madras, and particularly referred to but not printed in the said Government Order, viz., No. 944 I., dated 1st September 1906?

A.—The Government see no reason to place the report on the table.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know whether this Government Order and the report, etc., referred to therein come under the Official Secrets Act and so cannot be placed on the table of the House?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"That is not the reason for not placing them on the table of the House."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know then the reason why this Government Order and the connected papers could not be placed on the table of the House?"

[2nd November 1931]

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"It is ancient history and is a long one. Its appendices cover more than 57 printed pages and the enclosures referred to in this question probably cover many more pages. The cost of re-printing the Government Order and printing the enclosures would be high."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know whether a copy will be supplied to the Member who requires it?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"If any hon. Member wants information which is contained in the report, I shall be glad to give it to him."

Alleged damage to wet cultivation by the retention of the Railway Bridge at the Godavari station.

* 475 Q.—Pandit GANALA RAMAMURTI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it was brought to the notice of the Government that, on account of the Railway Bridge at the Godavari station, the irrigation in the districts of East and West Godavari is greatly suffering and that unless this be demolished and a new bridge be constructed near the Kadium station below the anicut, the wet cultivation would not be saved; and

(b) what orders the Government have issued thereon?

A.—(a) A suggestion akin to that in the first part of the question was made in a question in the Legislative Council (No. 1747) on 1st April 1930. A copy^a of the question and answer delivered is annexed. A report from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation on the question was placed on the table of the House in 1929, and is printed in the Proceedings of the Legislative Council, Volume XLVI, pages 637-638.

(b) No orders were issued.

Proposals, if any, by the Irrigation Development Board regarding schemes in the Nellore district.

* 476 Q.—Khan Bahadur YAHYA ALI SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Irrigation Development Board submitted any proposals to the Government regarding the schemes in Nellore district; and

(b) if so, whether the Government will be pleased to lay the same on the table?

A.—(a) The Irrigation Development Board has submitted its views on some schemes in Nellore district.

(b) The Government do not propose to place these reports upon the table.

2nd November 1931]

Negotiations with the Nizam's Government for the site of the Sangameswaram project.

* 477 Q.—Khan Bahadur YAHYA ALI SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether any negotiations were started recently by the Government with the Nizam's Government regarding the sites for the Tungabhadra-Kistna (Sangameswaram) project; and

(b) if so, whether they will be pleased to lay the correspondence on the table?

A.—(a) Negotiations have been started regarding the Tungabhadra-Kistna project.

(b) No.

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask, Sir, about the negotiations that are going on, whether they are merely concerned with the acquisition of lands or whether they are concerned with the appointment of the available water?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"They cover both questions."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether the Nizam's Government have put up any definite demand for a share of the water?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"At the conference I had at Hyderabad they did put up certain claims; but the whole matter is under negotiation."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Was the claim so exorbitant or unreasonable that it requires so much time for settlement? In view of the fact that there is large volume of water available, you can deal with the Nizam's Government more liberally."

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"The case is not as simple as the hon. Member seems to think. Alternative schemes are under consideration."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask whether the Government of the Nizam have presented any alternative scheme?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"Not at present; the whole matter is under negotiation; we hope to come to some arrangement."

Minor Irrigation

Permits for the lay-out of water-pipes from Courtallam falls.

* 478 Q.—Mr. M. D. T. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the number of permits for the lay-out of water-pipes from the waterfalls with their specifications and special water-supply that have been granted to the residents in and near Courtallam (Tinnevely district);

[2nd November 1931]

(b) whether the concessions are special and limited for a specific period and what have been the merits taken into consideration for the sanction of the same;

(c) whether the use of water has been so allowed for agriculture, public and temple uses alone or whether it has been sanctioned for the private use of individuals and bungalows also;

(d) whether the water right, irrigation and revenue aspects of the question have been taken into consideration and whether any revenue collections are being made out of such special privileges;

(e) how many and what protests have been made against the grant of such special privileges and what action has been taken regarding them; and

(f) whether any rules, regulations or standing orders have been passed or are about to be passed governing the grant of such privileges?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) Four licences for the diversion of water for domestic purposes have so far been issued to residents of Courtallam and its neighbourhood. The details are given below :—

Serial number.	To whom granted.	Diameter of pipe.	Remarks.
1 and 2.	His Highness the Maharaja of Travancore.	Two inches	Two bungalows served by one pipe. Do.
3	M.R. Ry. S. A. A. Annamalai Chettiyar	Do.	
4	Avargal. Raja Sir Annamalai Chettiyar.	One inch.	From the two inches pipe of No. 3.

The licences are not for any fixed period but are liable to be revoked at will by Government. They are subject to the payment of a fee of Rs. 25 per annum. The Government have also authorized the issue of a separate licence to Mr. S. A. A. Annamalai Chettiyar for the generation of electricity by means of the supply already licensed for use for domestic purposes. This licence is for a period of 25 years and is subject to an additional payment of Rs. 25 a year.

(d) The interests of irrigation and other rights and interests were considered before the issue of the licences was ordered. A fee of Rs. 25 is levied in each case.

(e) No such protests have been received. The licences do not involve the grant of any special privileges.

(f) The hon. Member is referred to the rules contained in paragraph 13 of Board's Standing Order No. 4, and Board's Standing Order No. 11-A.

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"With reference to the licence issued to Mr. S. A. A. Annamalai Chettiyar for his 'domestic purposes,' may I ask whether it is intended only for his own house or for supply to other houses also?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"I must ask for notice of the question."

2nd November 1931]

Failure of crops on the lands under Elundrakondan Periakulam.

* 479 Q.—Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether there has been failure of crops on both wet and water-rate lands under Elundrakondan Periakulam during three out of the last five faslis;

(b) whether there is no plan-marked channel for irrigation of dry lands S. Nos. 39, 48, 52, 55, 56 and 57 and whether irregular irrigation is resorted to for these lands; and

(c) whether the grant of water-rate permission in fasli 1340 was warranted by the rules on the subject?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The Government have not the information. A report has been called for.

Repairs to 'Chinnakasam' and 'Periakasam' of Perumudu village, Vellore taluk.

* 480 Q.—Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether representations have been made by the villagers of Perumudu village, No. 113, in the Vellore taluk, North Arcot district, to the District Collector of North Arcot and to the Government with regard to the grave and neglected condition of 'Chinnakasam' and 'Periakasam';

(b) when were repairs last executed to these kasams; and

(c) what is the present condition of these sources of irrigation?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) No representations on the subject have been received by the Government. As regards the other points raised in the question, the Government have no information.

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"With reference to clause (a), may I know whether any enquiries were made of the District Collector, North Arcot, whether representations were received by him?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"No, Sir."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know the reason why no enquiries were made when a specific question was put on that point?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"It is not within my personal knowledge and I did not think it necessary to enquire. If such representations have been made to the Collector, he will deal with them. If the petitioners are not satisfied with his disposal, they may appeal to the Board of Revenue."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether information will be called for from the Collector as to whether he has disposed of the representation made?"

[2nd November 1931]

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"These matters are within the competence of the Collector and the Board of Revenue; but as the hon. Member presses for the information I will obtain it for him."

Land Revenue Administration

Distribution of lands in Vavveru reserve, Nellore district, to the depressed classes.

* 481 Q.—Khan Bahadur YAHYA ALI SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) at what stage the distribution of land in Vavveru reserve, in Nellore district, to the depressed classes is;

(b) whether the Government are contemplating to sell those lands in public auction; and

(c) at what stage the proposal to provide irrigation facilities to that area is?

A.—(a) & (b) The land will be sold to members of the depressed classes at its market value after the excavation of the Vavveru channel and branches from the Kanigiri reservoir and the purchase price will be recovered in ten equal annual instalments without interest.

(c) The Government have approved an estimate amounting to Rs. 41,300 for the work and the provision of funds for it will be considered in framing the Budget for 1932–33.

Publication of the proposals of the Committee appointed to frame amendments to the Madras Estates Land Act.

* 482 Q.—Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether committees consisting of members of the Legislative Council and others appointed to propose amendments in 1922 and 1924 to the Madras Estates Land Act, submitted any reports or made any proposals;

(b) who were the members of the two committees;

(c) how long the committees worked;

(d) the expenditure incurred in connexion with the committees;

(e) whether the Government made use of the reports or proposals of the committees in drafting Bill No. 12 of 1931;

(f) whether the reports or the proposals were published; and

(g) if not, whether the Government will publish the reports or proposals of the committees?

A.—(a) No report was submitted by either of the committees. But their discussions and final decisions on the several amendments to the Estates Land Act are contained in the minutes of their meetings held from time to time. The decisions of the Committee of 1922 have not been separately abstracted; but those of the Committee of 1924 have been abstracted and tabulated.

2nd November 1931]

(b) The Committee of 1922 was an informal one convened by the then Law Member, the late Sir K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. The following took part in the deliberations of the Committee:—

1. The hon. Sir K. Srinivasa Ayyangar, Law Member (*President*).
2. The Zamindar of Pudur.
3. M.R.Ry. V. Ramadoss Pantulu Garu.
4. The Raja of Parlakimedi. Later, on his withdrawal from the Committee, M.R.Ry. Rao Sahib G. Venkataranga Rao Garu, Secretary, Madras Landholders' Association, took his place.
5. M.R.Ry. (now the Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur) B. Muniswami Nayudu Garu, M.L.C.

The Committee constituted in 1924, as it finally stood in 1927, consisted of the following:—

1. The hon. Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar, K.C.I.E. (the then Law Member), *Chairman*.
2. P. L. Moore, Esq., C.I.E., I.C.S.
3. M.R.Ry. T. R. Venkatarama Sastriyar Avargal, C.I.E. (the then Advocate-General, Madras).
4. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo, M.L.C.
5. M.R.Ry. A. Krishnaswami Ayyar Avargal, High Court Vakil, Mylapore (present Advocate-General).
6. M.R.Ry. K. Jagannatha Ayyar Avargal, High Court Vakil, Madras.
7. M.R.Ry. P. Venkataramana Rao Avargal, High Court Vakil, Madras.
8. M.R.Ry. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar Avargal, M.L.C., High Court Vakil.
9. The Raja of Parlakimedi.
10. J. M. Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur, Government Pleader and Public Prosecutor, Nellore.
11. M.R.Ry. S. Raja Rajeswara Setupati Avargal, Raja of Ramnad.
12. The Secretary, Madras Landholders' Association.
13. M.R.Ry. Rao Sahib K. A. Vedanayaga Tevar Avargal, President, Usilampatti Taluk Board, Madura.
14. M.R.Ry. V. Raghunatha Reddi of Tsadum, Punganur division, Chittoor.
15. M.R.Ry. M. Narasimham Pantulu, Deputy Collector.

[2nd November 1931]

16. M.R.Ry. N. Koilpillai Avargal, Assistant Secretary, Board of Revenue.
17. The Kumararaja of Venkatagiri, M.L.C.
18. M.R.Ry. T. M. Krishnaswami Ayyar Avargal, High Court Vakil, Madras.
19. M.R.Ry. B. Satyanarayana Pantulu Garu, High Court Vakil, Madras.
20. M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur T. Raghavayya Pantulu Garu, c.s.i., Secretary to the Committee.

- (c) The informal Committee of 1922 held in all nine meetings in October 1922. The Committee constituted in June 1924 concluded its labours in May 1927.
- (d) The only item of expenditure incurred on account of the committees was the travelling allowance paid to the non-official members from the mufassal who attended the meetings of committees. The information required is not available as travelling allowance bills are retained only for a period of three years.
- (e) The views of the committees on the several amendments to the Act were made use of in drafting the Bill.
- (f) & (g) As already stated in answer to clause (a), no reports were submitted to the Government by either of the committees; and the Government do not consider it necessary to publish the proceedings of the committees.

Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"With reference to clause (f) of the answer, may I ask the hon. Member to state why the report of the Committee cannot be published?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"The hon. Member refers to a report which does not exist. The question whether a summary of the decisions of the Committee and the recommendations that it would probably have made should be laid before the Select Committee will receive the consideration of Government."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know, with reference to (d), whether the information will not be available from the Account Books with the Government?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"I am afraid, not."

Modification of the rules regarding grant of permission to take water for second crop irrigation in Bhimavaram Revenue division.

* 483 Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the principles hitherto in force in regard to the grant of permission to take water for a second crop also in the case of single crop wet lands of Bhimavaram Revenue division, West Godavari district; and

2nd November 1931]

(b) whether they were modified and if so, in what way and under what authority and whether such modification had any reference to the alleged satyagraha movement in the division?

A.—(a) & (b) Until fasli 1338 the distribution of water for the cultivation of a second crop on single crop wet lands in the Godavari Western delta, which includes the Bhimavaram Revenue division, was settled each year at a conference held by the officers of the Public Works and Revenue Departments with the ryots. As this arrangement had not been satisfactory, the Government in February 1926 sanctioned a special staff for the localization of the second crop ayacut. The special staff after detailed investigation formed three zones, viz., (1) a permanent zone, consisting of lands which could be supplied with water for a second crop every year, (2) a rotation zone, consisting of lands which could be supplied with water for a second crop once in four, three or two years according to the rotation fixed, and (3) an exclusion zone, consisting of lands which could not be supplied with water for a second crop in any year. This scheme was given effect to with effect from fasli 1338 under the orders of Government. The relevant papers connected with the scheme were placed on the table of the Legislative Council on 6th August 1929 and 6th November 1930. Detailed lists of the lands included in the rotation and permanent zones, however, have not yet been published. They are being prepared, in terms of the resurvey. Meanwhile a notification is being published every year in the District Gazette showing the area for which water for a second crop can be supplied in that year. An extent of 1,187.05 acres of land in the rotation zone and 87.50 acres of land in the permanent zone in the Bhimavaram division were temporarily excluded from the notification relating to fasli 1340 for the reason that the owners of those lands took an active and prominent part in the civil disobedience movement. In view of the subsequent political settlement, however, the Board of Revenue, under instructions from Government, issued orders in April 1931 directing that the enhanced water-cess levied for the irrigation of the lands which had been excluded from the second crop zone in fasli 1340 should be remitted if the parties applied for such remission.

Collection of land revenue in South Kanara district.

* 484 Q.—Khan Bahadur MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) what is the extent of arrears of land revenue in South Kanara district and in Kasaragod taluk and whether it was due to economic distress;

[2nd November 1931]

(b) how many cases of attachment of movable and immovable properties respectively there were;

(c) how many immovable properties had to be sold; and

(d) in how many cases the assessment was recovered before confirmation of the sale both in South Kanara and in the Kasaragod taluk respectively?

A.—(a) The land revenue arrears at the end of August 1931 amounted to Rs. 41,985 in South Kanara. The Government have no separate information as regards the Kasaragod taluk. They are not aware that the arrears were due to economic distress.

(b), (c) & (d) The Government have no information.

Khan Bahadur MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur:—"With reference to answers to clauses (b), (c) and (d), will Government be pleased to call for the information and satisfy themselves that the arrears there are due to economic distress?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"The reports that we receive from the Board of Revenue will show whether there was an excessive number of processes issued for the recovery of land revenue. We will then consider whether it is necessary to take any special action."

Destruction of rice and sugarcane crops by floods in South Kanara.

* 485 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received or called for any report regarding the damage caused by floods last month to rice and sugarcane crop in South Kanara; and

(b) whether the Government propose to grant any remission in assessment to fields adjoining rivers where the first rice crop has been entirely destroyed by floods?

A.—(a) & (b) A report has been called for.

Appointment of the Huzur Sarishtadar of Kurnool.

* 486 Q.—Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) on what grounds may a person be appointed as Huzur Sarishtadar though he has not put in a service of two years as Tahsildar, and retained in that office though he has served three years in it;

(b) whether these grounds exist, for instance, in the case of Mr. Jaganayakulu Nayudu, Huzur Sarishtadar of Kurnool; and

(c) what steps the Government have taken to ensure compliance with the rules made by them?

A.—(a) The matter is governed by Board's Standing Order No. 137.

(b) The Government have not the information.

(c) Normally, the Government presume that their orders will be obeyed.

2nd November 1931]

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" May I know whether they have made enquiries if in this case the Government Order has been obeyed? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—" All orders are presumed to be obeyed."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" Have the Government made enquiries? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—" I have already answered in the negative."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" Will the Government make enquiries? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—" As the hon. Member makes himself responsible for the statement that the order has not been obeyed, I will enquire."

Proposed abolition of the Atmakur Revenue division.

* 487 Q.—Khan Bahadur YAHYA ALI SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Atmakur Revenue division in Nellore district is going to be abolished as a measure of retrenchment; and

(b) if so, from what date; and how the redistribution of the Revenue divisions in the district will be made?

A.—(a) Yes, orders to that effect have been issued.

(b) The date has not been fixed. On the abolition of the Atmakur division, the Udayagiri taluk will be added to the Kavali division and the Atmakur taluk to the Nellore division.

Resurvey in South Kanara.

* 488 Q.— Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state whether the Government have come to any decision regarding the question of resurvey in South Kanara?

A.—The Government have decided that owing to the present financial stringency the resurvey operations in the South Kanara district should be suspended immediately.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—" May I know, Sir, whether the question of resurvey in South Kanara district will be re-opened after the present financial stringency has passed off? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—" That is a matter for decision by the Government at that time."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—" May I know for what period the Survey Party was working in South Kanara district? "

[2nd November 1931]

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"I must ask for notice of that question."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"Is it not a waste of expenditure for the Government if they stop re-survey operations in the middle?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"In certain cases it may be necessary to complete the operations that are going on and then stop further work."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask whether resurvey has been given up in other districts also?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"It has been also suspended in Salem. I am not sure of other districts. I must ask for notice of that question."

Public Service

Increments to unpassed clerks in the Registration Department.

* 489 Q.—Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether unpassed men serving as clerks in the Registration Department were allowed certain increments in their pay;

(b) whether the Inspector-General of Registration was authorized to exempt unpassed men and allow them to draw increments up to Rs. 50 in G.O. No. 722, Education, dated 13th June 1922;

(c) whether such exemptions and increments are now being objected to by the Accountant-General; and

(d) whether the Government will be pleased to regularize their own Government Order and help the poor clerks?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) Yes; but provided that *bona fide* efforts had been made without success to get suitable qualified men for the posts. This power was, however, subsequently withdrawn in 1926.

(c) Objection was taken only in respect—

(i) of clerks who were not specifically exempted by the Inspector-General in respect of the time-scale of pay;

(ii) of clerks who were exempted by the Inspector-General after the power of exemption had been withdrawn from heads of departments; and

(iii) of clerks who had been permitted to draw increments irregularly from a date prior to that on which they were exempted.

2nd November 1931]

- (d) Orders have been passed in all the cases brought to notice.
A copy * of the orders is placed on the table.

Applications received by the Madras Services Commission from the members of the depressed classes for appointments, etc.

* 490 Q.—Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the number of applications received by the Public Services Commission from the depressed classes either applying for new posts or for appearing for the various examinations held by the Commission during the years 1929 and 1930;

(b) how many of these candidates passed the competitive examinations and how many of them were able to get employed; and

(c) a list of candidates of depressed classes that are in the reserve and eligible for posts that may either fall vacant or may be created in the Government service?

A.—(a) The hon. Member is apparently referring to the Madras Services Commission. This has been in existence since the 3rd January 1930. The selections made during the first three months of that year as shown in Appendix C to the report of the Commission for 1929–30 which has already been placed on the table. For information as to the rest of the year, the hon. Member is requested to await publication of the report of the Commission for 1930–31.

(b) No competitive examination was held in 1930.

(c) Waiting lists were drawn up by the Commission only in respect of the following classes:—

- (1) Clerks and typists;
- (2) School Assistants and Assistant Lecturers; and
- (3) Sub-Assistant Inspectresses and School Assistants.

The lists in respect of the first two classes have already been published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* and in the list in respect of the third class, all candidates but one, who does not belong to a depressed class, have been appointed.

Madras Services Commission and the production of medical certificates by candidates.

* 491 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) why the Madras Services Commission wants applicants for jobs to produce medical certificates from officers of the rank of civil surgeons; and

[2nd November 1931]

(b) whether any representations have been made to the Government to the effect that certificates got from any registered medical practitioner may be treated as sufficient for the purpose of at least the preliminary selection?

A.—(a) Under subsidiary rule 2 to Fundamental Rule 10, the certificate required before any person, except a military pensioner, may be appointed (otherwise than as a menial paid from contingencies) to a permanent post under Government must ordinarily be signed by a Commissioned Medical Officer or a Civil Medical Officer of rank not lower than a Civil Surgeon or a District Medical Officer.

(b) No.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"May I know, Sir, whether the Government will consider the desirability of issuing instructions to the Public Services Commission that certificates from Commissioned Medical Officers or Civil Surgeons may be dispensed with in the case of candidates who apply for jobs, and that certificates from Registered Medical Practitioners are sufficient for the purpose?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"One of the qualifications for selection for Government service is medical fitness. If the hon. Member's suggestion were accepted a selected candidate would have to get a second medical certificate with reference to Subsidiary Rule 2 to Fundamental Rule 10 before he could be actually appointed."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask, Sir, whether, in view of the fact that the question under reference merely refers to applicants who apply for jobs and not to persons who are going to hold the posts permanently, the Government will consider the advisability of dispensing with the production of such certificates from Commissioned Medical Officers? The selection of these candidates does not mean their immediate appointment to any posts."

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"The answer that I gave to Mr. Shetty's supplemental question also applies to this."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"In view of the fact that a certificate from a Commissioned Medical Officer under Fundamental Rule 10 (2) is required only in the case of those people who are appointed to any permanent post, may I ask the Government to issue instructions to the Public Services Commission to suspend the production of such certificates in the case of those people who apply for jobs to the Public Services Commission and also tell them that it is enough if they produce certificates from Registered Medical Practitioners?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"I am not prepared to do that."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I know if all the applicants that apply for posts are appointed?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"No, Sir."

2nd November 1931]

• Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"In view of that answer, does not the Government realize that it is merely waste of money to the poor candidates if all of them are asked to produce certificates of fitness?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"One of the qualifications required for selection of candidates is that they should be medically fit. It is for that reason that the Madras Services Commission requires a medical opinion on each candidate."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I know if the medical certificate given by any other Registered Medical Practitioner is not enough for that purpose?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"No, Sir, for the reason I have already given."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Is it not a fact that after once they are selected, they are asked to undergo another medical examination?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"Not in the case of most appointments. It may be necessary in the case of certain higher appointments."

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR:—"May I know whether Government will amend the rules so as to insist on the production of these certificates only for the final selection?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"I am afraid I do not understand what the hon. Member means by 'final selection'."

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR:—"A number of candidates apply, say about 300 or 400, for the preliminary selection. Only about 200 or 300 come for final selection, and others are thrown out. My question is whether the production of certificates cannot be insisted on only in the case of those who are retained after the final selection."

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"The production of a medical certificate is insisted upon at the very beginning and not before the final selection. In fact, one of the reasons for the rejection of an application may be medical unfitness."

Finance

Submission of the complete retrenchment proposals to the Legislative Council.

* 492 Q.—Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) when he expects he would be able to lay before the House the complete retrenchment proposals of the Government;

(b) whether he will give the Council an idea of how the new retrenchment proposals will affect the budget; and

(c) whether he will introduce a revised budget?

[2nd November 1931]

A.—(a) & (b) It will be several months before the complete retrenchment proposals of the Government can be formulated. Meanwhile in reply to question No. 345-A I have already laid before the House the Completest possible information of the progress so far made both by the Retrenchment Committee and by Government in the matter of retrenchment.

(c) The Government do not consider it necessary to introduce a revised budget.

Financial position of the Province as affected by the economic depression.

* 493 Q.—Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) how and to what extent the financial position of the Presidency has been affected by the economic depression; and

(b) whether he intends to introduce any supplementary or additional estimates which would give the House an opportunity of expressing an opinion on the measures taken to counteract the deficit in the Budget?

A.—(a) A fall in revenue by about Rs. 132 lakhs is anticipated in the current year chiefly under Excise. It is not possible to say what portion of the fall is due solely to economic depression.

(b) It is not proposed to introduce any supplementary or additional estimates except to move demands for supplementary grants for specific items of expenditure for which the vote of the Council is necessary.

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—“ In view of the answer given by the hon. the Finance Member, may I know what is the procedure that is going to be adopted by the Retrenchment Committee? May I know whether the hon. Member proposes to place before the Retrenchment Committee only proposals for normal standard of expenditure which would be sufficiently covered by normal revenues so as to leave an opening balance, or a wider procedure is going to be followed? ”

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—“ A wider procedure will be followed. ”

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—“ May I know if the hon. the Finance Member will kindly give a little more information than is available from the communique that is placed before the House regarding retrenchment proposals? ”

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—“ I should be very happy to expand the communique if the hon. Member considers it necessary. I do not understand in what direction the hon. Member wants information. ”

2nd November 1931]

Communication of the retrenchment proposals to the Members of the Council.

* 494 Q.—MR. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have considered the desirability of communicating to all the Members of the Council the retrenchment proposals which are sent to Members of the Retrenchment Committee for consideration before they meet and decide about them; and

(b) how many times the Retrenchment Committee has so far met and when it is expected to finish its work?

A.—(a) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the reply to question No. 345-A. Government do not consider that it would be desirable to follow the suggestion made by the hon. Member. If the intention is that no measure of retrenchment should be introduced by Government without the concurrence of this House, it is only necessary to point out that it would be physically impossible for all hon. Members to consider all the numerous proposals that are made; and the result in practice would be that the object in view would be defeated.

(b) The Committee have hitherto held 24 meetings. It is impossible to say when their labours will be finished, but every effort will be made to conclude them before the end of the financial year.

MR. V. T. ARASU:—“ Will the hon. the Finance Member be pleased to place before this House a statement showing as to what are the retrenchment proposals that Government have before them and also the proposals they have already given effect to, and also give this House an opportunity of discussing all the retrenchment proposals ? ”

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—“ I do not think it will be possible for the Government to place every question of retrenchment on the table of this House for the discussion of hon. Members. The fullest possible information has been given in answer to question No. 345-A and a communiqué concerning the retrenchment proposals has already been placed on the table of the House. ”

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—“ May I ask what is the anticipated figure of revenue to which the Government are adjusting their retrenchment proposals ? ”

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—“ It may be roughly about 16 crores. ”

MR. V. T. ARASU:—“ Arising out of the answer given by the hon. the Finance Member, may I ask whether hon. Members of this House are unfit to discuss the question of retrenchment ? ”

[2nd November 1931]

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"No, not at all. What I said was that, if every item of retrenchment were to be placed before this House and discussed by them, there would not be time to effect a single measure of retrenchment."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I know if the Government are going to give effect to the proposals of the Retrenchment Committee or are they going to make any changes?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"I have already said that in tables A and B appended to question No. 345-A, I have given a statement showing the financial effect of the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee. I cannot give an undertaking that Government will give effect to all those recommendations."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I know if there are certain cases in which the Government have not given effect to the proposals of the Retrenchment Committee?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"In many instances the Government have given effect to the proposals of the Retrenchment Committee. I believe there are some cases in which the Government have not accepted their recommendations, and some which are still under consideration."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"With reference to the answer given to this question, may I ask whether the hon. Member will not be pleased to give an opportunity to this House to express its opinion on specific items of expenditure which are recommended to be cut by the Retrenchment Committee?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"I do not think it will be possible to give an opportunity to the House to discuss every single item that comes before the Retrenchment Committee. I presume when the Retrenchment Committee's report is placed on the table of the House, there will be ample opportunity for hon. Members to express their views."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Will it be possible for the Government to say now whether they could balance the budget?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"I wish I could say so."

Relative percentage of cuts in the salaries of the services.

* 495 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) what the percentage is of cut in salaries recommended by the Retrenchment Committee and accepted by Government in the case of (1) Menial services, (2) Subordinate services, (3) Gazetted services and (4) Special posts;

(b) how this cut works out ultimately in the case of gazetted officers drawing Rs. 1,000 and above as compared with the non-gazetted officers; and

2nd November 1931]

(c) how the Government propose to remove the inequality, if any, in the actual working out of the general cut in salaries?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The whole matter is under the consideration of Government and they are not in a position to make any announcement at present. An announcement will be made as soon as final decisions are reached.

Proposals regarding retrenchment.

* 496 Q.—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDAR: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) when the Retrenchment Committee is expected to conclude their sittings and finish their labours;

(b) what the probable amount will be that can be saved after effecting these retrenchments;

(c) whether there is any proposal to cut the salaries of officers; and

(d) if so, on what scale, and in what order?

A.—(a) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to clause (b) of Question No. 494.

(b) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to Question No. 345-A.

(c) & (d) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to Question No. 495.

Recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee.

*497 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government will place before the Council the recommendations of the Retrenchment Officer and the Retrenchment Committee and the decisions of the Government thereon before the same are given effect to; and

(b) what is the procedure the Government propose to follow in this matter?

A.—(a) & (b) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the reply to Question No. 345-A in which full answer has been given.

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"May I ask the Government whether all the retrenchment proposals will be placed before the Members of this House to enable them to make their suggestions to the Members of the Retrenchment Committee before the latter meet to consider them?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"I have already said that the suggested procedure would practically mean that we have to place every item before this House. That is not practical. If that is to be done, we will never get the retrenchment proposals completed in time."

[2nd November 1931]

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" May I know from the hon. Member in what time it will be possible for him to decide on the question of percentage cut ? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" The matter is not for the Retrenchment Committee. It is for the Government to decide. "

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" May I know how long it will take for the Government to decide ? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" I cannot prophesy. "

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know whether this 10 per cent cut that was announced the other day by His Excellency the Governor does not affect the lower officers ? Is it not a real hardship to those who are drawing less than Rs. 200 or 300, because those who draw more will have to undergo a surrender or only 3 or 4 per cent of their salaries roughly, excluding the income-tax ? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" I must ask for notice of that question. I am not aware whether His Excellency referred to a general 10 per cent cut. The 10 per cent cut that he referred to was with reference to his own salary, and that of Members of the Government. "

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" May I know if the question of percentage cuts of salaries was discussed by the Retrenchment Committee ? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" It was discussed by the Retrenchment Committee. "

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" Was any recommendation made by them ? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" Yes, Sir. "

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" May I know what is the percentage suggested by them ? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" The Retrenchment Committee made general suggestions that there should be cuts ranging from 1 to 7 per cent. "

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" Does the hon. Member think that 10 per cent cut is sufficient ? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" Quite sufficient. "

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR:—" Is it inclusive or exclusive of income-tax ? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" I must ask for notice. "

Budget deficit during the current year.

*498 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) the total amount of deficit likely to arise in the budget estimates for the whole of the current year, and how it is distributed under each head of revenue;

2nd November 1931]

(b) what the total amount of saving effected by the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee is;

(c) to what extent have the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee been accepted and in what manner;

(d) what saving is effected by retrenchment in each of the departments under (1) Reserved and (2) Transferred respectively;

(e) what the extent is of the saving effected by (1) the reduction or the abolition of allowances, (2) the reduction of salaries, (3) the abolition of posts, (4) the retirement of officers and servants and (5) the abolition of departments of service; and

(f) what the posts are that have been hitherto abolished and contemplated to be abolished under the scheme of retrenchment in the gazetted ranks in each department under Reserved and Transferred respectively?

A.—(a) A total fall in revenue amounting to about Rs. 132 lakhs, as detailed below, is at present anticipated, as compared with the budget:—

	RS.
	LAKHS.
Excise	95
Stamps	19
Forest	14
Net effect of anticipated increases and decreases under other heads	4
	132

(b), (c), (e) & (f) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to question No. 354-A which gives the fullest information at present possible regarding the progress of retrenchment.

(d) Out of the Rs. 63 lakhs savings recommended by the Retrenchment Committee nearly Rs. 29 lakhs represent savings on Civil Works and Allowances of all kinds, the expenditure on which is common to all departments. Of the balance of Rs. 34 lakhs about Rs. 30 lakhs appertain to the Transferred, and about Rs. 4 lakhs to the Reserved departments so far examined.

Of the Rs. 88 lakhs savings secured so far by Government during the current year, about Rs. 26½ lakhs represent savings on Civil Works and allowances which are common to all departments, and of the balance of Rs. 61½ lakhs, Rs. 30 lakhs come from Reserved departments and Rs. 31½ lakhs from the Transferred departments.

[2nd November 1931]

Mr. YAKUB HASAN:—" May I know what proportion this fall of Rs. 95 lakhs in excise revenue bears to the budgeted income? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" The budgeted income at the beginning of the year was about 5 crores of rupees. Ninety-five lakhs of rupees roughly works out at one-fifth.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know what this deficit in Excise revenue is due to? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" Mostly owing to economic pressure and partly owing to agitation."

Savings on account of revision of salaries.

* 499 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) the amount of saving effected or expected to be effected by the revision of scales of salary in the gazetted and non-gazetted ranks; and

(b) what the respective posts are for which revision of scales of salary has been proposed?

A.—(a) & (b) The Retrenchment Committee are examining the question of revising the scales of pay for future entrants to all Provincial, Subordinate and Specialist services and it is understood that they have not yet completed their examination. No proposals have yet been received and it will probably be some time before final recommendations are made.

Saving effected by the introduction of fixed travelling allowance.

*500 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have examined the extent of saving that might be effected by the introduction of fixed travelling allowance; and

(b) if so, what are the results of their investigation, and the reasons for their decision?

A.—(a) No.

(b) No; but the possibility of effecting savings in the manner indicated was referred to the Retrenchment Committee for consideration and they have recently recommended that Government should examine further the possibility, without involving increased expenditure, of extending the system of fixed travelling allowance to suitable classes of officers who have a fixed amount of touring to do within a limited area. Most officers in this category already receive fixed travelling allowance.

2nd November 1931]

Annual expenditure of Government towards the payment of the various allowances.

*501 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) the total expenditure incurred by Government annually in the payment of (i) duty allowance, (ii) presidency allowance, (iii) house rent or rent for free quarters, (iv) conveyance allowance, (v) special allowance and (vi) special pay to gazetted and non-gazetted servants, respectively, during the last five years in the City of Madras; and

(b) what is the amount incurred similarly in the case of gazetted and non-gazetted servants of the Government employed in the mufassal?

A.—(a) & (b) The statistics required by the hon. Member are not available and their collection for a period of five years would involve an expenditure of time and labour which would not be commensurate with the result. The following is, however, the analysis of the total expenditure for which provision was made in the Budget Estimate for 1931-32 on the special pays and compensatory allowances of gazetted and non-gazetted officers:—

Nature of allowances.	Gazetted officers.	Non-gazetted officers.	Total.
	LAKHS.	LAKHS.	LAKHS.
(1) Special pay (added responsibility, arduous nature, and specific addition to work) ..	3.87	5.41	9.28
(2) Special pay (unhealthy localities) ..	.21	3.19	3.40
(3) Presidency allowances and house rent	1.44	1.06	2.50
(4) Conveyance allowances	.18	.69	.87
(5) Other allowances (uniform, ration, dhobi, horse and saddlery, etc.)	.36	7.55	7.91
Total ..	6.06	17.90	23.96

Standard of living among the working and middle classes.

* 502 Q.—Mr. C. BASU DEV: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state— 11-30 a.m.

(a) whether they have appointed any officer of the Government to investigate into the standards of living of average families among the working and middle classes with a view to fixing their salaries;

(b) whether the Government have any proposal before them to reduce the pay of their servants drawing salaries of Rs. 40 a month and upwards; and

[2nd November 1931]

(c) if the answers to the above two clauses are in the affirmative, whether the Government will be pleased to postpone the proposed reduction pending the report of the officer referred to in clause (a)?

A.—(a) No.

(b) The matter is under consideration.

(c) Does not arise.

Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"Will the Government be pleased to institute an enquiry into these matters?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"The Government do not think it necessary."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Are the Government aware that in Bombay at least the Labour offices have been instructed to submit their report regarding the family budget of working and middle class families?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"I am aware of that."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Will the Government consider the desirability of instructing the Labour Commissioner in Madras to report about their condition?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"No, Sir."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Does the Government consider it not important?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"It is important, but not possible."

Railways

Halting of the Mail train at Kasaragod.

* 503 Q.—Khan Bahadur MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state why the Mail train does not stop as usual 10 minutes for watering at Kasaragod?

A.—The Government have no information.

Khan Bahadur MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur:—"Will the Government kindly ascertain whether this practice is not causing much inconvenience to the public?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"It is a matter for the Government of India, to whom representations may be made."

Local Self-Government

Amount of motor vehicles tax collected during the last and the present quarter.

* 504 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) the total amount of motor vehicles taxation collected in each district in the last quarter and in the present quarter also;

2nd November 1931]

(b) the amount paid out of this taxation to the local bodies in each district in each of these two quarters; and

(c) whether the sums collected by the Government and the amounts paid to the local bodies have exceeded or fallen short of the estimates made at the time the Motor Vehicles Taxation Bill was under consideration?

A.—(a) A statement^a is laid on the table of the House.

(b) Three-sixteenths of the amounts shown in the appendix to G.O. No. 1081, L. & M., dated 28th March 1931 (copy^a placed on the table of the House) was paid to the local bodies for each of the two quarters.

(c) The sums collected so far have fallen considerably short of the estimates made at the time when the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Bill was under consideration.

The amounts paid to local bodies for the first two quarters have been calculated on the basis of the original estimates, but local bodies have been warned to expect less in future.

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"In view of the considerable shortage of collections, will the Government consider the desirability of repealing the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"No, Sir."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Does the Government expect to collect the full estimated amount before the end of the year?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"It is not possible to say now what will be the total amount collected before the end of the year."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"By how much has the collection fallen short of the estimate now?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"By about 50 per cent."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Will the Government investigate the reasons why the collections have been so small?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"No, Sir."

Mr. F. E. JAMES:—"May I ask the hon. Minister whether the number of buses is not much larger in areas where the licence fees levied by local boards are not heavy?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I have no information."

Mr. F. E. JAMES:—"Will the hon. Minister please collect the necessary information and consider possible plans whereby this grossly heavy burden upon the motor industry may be alleviated?"

[2nd November 1931]

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"Representations have been made to Government by parties interested in this question. Government have called for information as to the income derived by local bodies from licence fees both last year and in the first half of the present year. After the information is collected, Government will examine it and find out to what extent the alleged heavy licence fees levied by district boards are responsible for reducing the number of buses and whether any relief can be given."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"Is the hon. Minister aware that there are still a large number of buses which have not taken out the motor licence?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I am not aware of it, Sir."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"When the collections have fallen down by fifty per cent., how do the Government propose to pay the local bodies?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"The amount collected will be distributed *pro rata* among the local bodies. The fall is due not to the heaviness of the tax but to various other economic factors."

Mr. F. E. JAMES:—"Is the hon. Minister aware of the fact that the collection of the tax under the Motor Vehicles Act is being evaded owing to certain regulations under the Act? If so, will he tell the House what he proposes to do to examine the regulations with a view to removing those obstacles?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"Here also various representations have been made to Government with regard to the hardship caused by certain regulations under the Act. The whole matter is under consideration by the Government. Some of the representatives of persons who are interested in the question will also be invited to put their views before the Government."

Khan Bahadur MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur:—"Will the Government be pleased to compensate the local bodies for the loss caused to them by the abolition of the tolls and by the payment of only a portion of what they were expecting from the motor taxation?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"There is no question of paying compensation as the Act provides that the amount collected under the Act should be distributed *pro rata* among the local bodies concerned."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Have not the local bodies begun to clamour for their due share?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"Not yet; I am sure they realize the difficult situation."

2nd November 1931]

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"If Government do not pay the local bodies what they have been expecting all along, how do they expect them to balance their budget?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"The local bodies are only in the same position as the Local Government."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"Do the Government realize that they have over-estimated the receipts at the time the Bill was passed?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I do not think Government over-estimated the income from this taxation. The difficulty is that they never expected this financial crisis when the Bill was framed."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"In view of the fact that the amount to be realized is not going to reach the anticipated figure and that the losses to the local bodies are due to the passing of this Act and the abolition of the tolls, what do the Government propose to do to help the local bodies to balance their budgets?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"Local bodies are taking their own action—retrenchment of expenditure and so on."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Does the hon. Minister hold that the anticipated revenue has not been realized on account of the general depression or on account of certain defects in the Act itself?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I have already answered that question."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Having regard to the fact that this depression began as early as 1929, how can that be a reason for the motor tax collections falling short of the estimates which were framed only recently?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I don't admit that the depression began in 1929."

Mr. YAKUB HASAN:—"Considering that the Act has proved so disastrous, will the Government take steps to repeal it?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"The Act has not proved disastrous. On the other hand, it has proved beneficial to agriculturists."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"As the local bodies are not able to balance their budgets, will the Government be pleased to reduce the amounts of the opening and closing balances of local bodies?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"It is the business of local bodies to look to that."

[2nd November 1931]

Sanitary arrangements in Courtallam.

* 505 Q.—**Mr. M. D. T. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR**:—Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether any and what facilities have been provided in Courtallam (Tinnevely district) for the sanitary convenience and cleanliness for the large floating population that go over there seasonally and for religious festivals;

(b) whether any scheme of town-planning has been adopted for the residential area to prevent overcrowding; and

(c) whether suitable areas and gardens have been reserved and declared so for the use of the public?

A.—(a) A special committee consisting of the President, District Board, Tinnevely, President, Taluk Board, Tinnevely, and the President, Panchayat Board, Tenkasi, the District Health Officer, Tinnevely, and the Trustees of the Courtallam temple has resolved to carry out the following improvements:—

(i) Construction of new latrines and urinals near the Falls, Temple, Local Fund choultries and other important places;

(ii) appointment of additional scavengers; and

(iii) introduction of private scavenging system throughout the area.

(b) The provisions of the Madras Town-Planning Act, 1920, were extended to Courtallam in 1926 and the Tenkasi Panchayat Board has been requested to take action for the preparation of a Town-Planning Scheme in respect of the area in Courtallam and submit the scheme to the Government for sanction. The Board proposes to take action shortly.

(c) No suitable area or gardens have been reserved for the use of the public.

Repairs to the cart-track running along battai poramboke in Keelanoor village.

* 506 Q.—**Rao Sahib V. DHARMALINGAM PILLAI**: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Adi-Dravidas of Perathur cheri have been praying for the last ten years to repair and put into cartable condition for their egress and ingress, the cart-track running along battai porambokes of Keelanoor village, No. 116, Tiruvallur taluk, Chingleput district, connecting the cheris of Perathur and Vishnuvakkam villages with the Red Hills-Tiruvallur road, at the southern end of the causeway constructed across Kattangal in R.S. No. 462 of Keelanoor village;

2nd November 1931]

(b) whether it is a fact that the said cart-track has been encroached upon by the adjacent wet land cultivator by fencing it with prickly-pears and that he was prosecuted by the Revenue Department and ordered to remove the prickly-pear growth before June 1929;

(c) whether it is a fact that the Tiruvallur Taluk Board sanctioned a sum of Rs. 600 for the renewal of the said cart-track known as Perathur or Vishnuvakkam cart-track;

(d) whether it is a fact that the District Munsif of Tiruvallur has issued an injunction in July 1930, that neither a footpath nor a cart-track can be created across Kattangal other than the one that exists as a causeway in R.S. No. 462 of Keelanoor village;

(e) whether it is a fact that the Tiruvallur Taluk Board is contemplating to open a new road in R.S. Nos. 96 and 98 of Vishnuvakkam village abandoning the one in existence; and

(f) what action it is proposed to take for putting into a cartable condition the cart-track?

A.—(a) to (f) Government have no information. The persons aggrieved should move the local boards concerned.

Medical

Retention on the active list of the Second Surgeon of the Madras General Hospital.

* 507 Q.—Mr. V. T. ARASU: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Second Surgeon of the Madras General Hospital has been awarded damages by the Madras High Court for injuries sustained in a railway compartment and consequent incapacity to do certain kinds of important surgical operations; and

(b) if so, why that Surgeon is still being kept on the active list, and has not been invalidated?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The incapacity was only temporary.

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—“ May I ask the hon. Minister whether it is not a fact that this Surgeon has been permanently incapacitated for doing certain kinds of important operations? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—“ No, Sir.”

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—“ Did not the High Court in their judgment say that he has been permanently incapacitated for doing certain kinds of important operations? Will the hon. Minister place a copy of the judgment on the table of the House? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—“ I don't think they said so, Sir. The hon. Member may obtain a copy of the judgment if he likes.”

[2nd November 1931]

*Collection of consultation fees by doctors working in the
King George's Hospital, Vizagapatam.*

* 508 Q.—Rao Sahib B. VENKATARAMAYYA: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the X-ray specialist attached to the King George's Hospital, Vizagapatam, is collecting higher fees from patients attending the hospital and crediting a lower sum to the Government account;

(b) whether it is a fact that complaints were made against him, and if so, what action was taken by the Government on the complaints;

(c) whether it is a fact that the doctors working in the said hospital have consulting rooms at home and whether patients seeking admission into the hospital are invariably subjected to payment of consultation fees to the various doctors; and

(d) whether it is a fact that patients admitted into the hospital are made to pay the cost of medicines and also for the diets supplied to them?

A.—(a) & (b) Certain allegations have been made against the Radiologist in the matter and an enquiry has been ordered into them.

(c) No.

(d) According to the rules relating to the levy of fees for medical treatment in Government Medical institutions patients whose income is Rs. 50 a month or more are charged for accommodation, medical advice, nursing and diet. Patients entitled to free medical attendance are charged for accommodation and diet only.

Rao Sahib B. VENKATARAMAYYA:—“May I know the nature of the allegations and the result of the enquiry?”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—“I am afraid I cannot at present disclose the nature of the allegations which are under enquiry.”

Public Health

Free distribution of quinine in South Kanara district.

* 509 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether free distribution of quinine has given satisfactory results in controlling malaria in Puttur and Karkal taluks in South Kanara;

2nd November 1931]

(b) whether representations have been made to him during his visit to the district to extend the benefit of this system to the rest of the taluks also; and

(c) what action Government have taken in this matter?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) The question of extending the experimental scheme of free distribution of quinine to the other taluks in the district is under consideration.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—“ May I know if Government have got a sufficient supply of quinine and whether there is any other difficulty in extending the free supply of quinine to the rest of the taluks also? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—“ It is not a question of Government not having a sufficient supply of quinine. The question is the cost of free distribution of the substance.”

Water-supply scheme of the Tuticorin Municipality.

* 510 Q.—Mr. M. D. T. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Tuticorin Municipality has been collecting a heavy tax from the year 1915 for a protected scheme of water-supply to the town;

(b) whether the works pertaining to the scheme finally sanctioned by the Government in 1926 are still pending completion;

(c) whether the Government have investigated into the delay in the execution of the works and what steps have been or are proposed to be taken to complete the works without further delay; and

(d) when the Government expect the works to be completed and handed over to the municipality?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer given to question No. 529.

Agriculture

Correspondence with the Secretary of State for sanction to appoint an I.C.S. officer as Director of Agriculture.

* 511 Q.—Mr. V. T. ARASU: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government have addressed the Central Government and the Secretary of State for India for permission to appoint a civilian as permanent Director of Agriculture; and

(b) if so, the reasons that impelled the Government to overlook the claims of the men in the Agricultural department?

A.—(a) & (b) The question of a permanent successor to Mr. Hilson is still under the consideration of Government.

[2nd November 1931]

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" May I know from the hon. the Second Minister the special reasons for the delay in filling up the appointment? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—" The matter is still under consideration. The reply is there on the paper."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" Has the Government addressed the Government of India or the Secretary of State for permission to appoint a civilian to the post of Director of Agriculture? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—" I am not in a position to say more than what is put on the paper."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" Is not the hon. Minister in a position to say whether or not he has addressed any such communication to the Government of India or the Secretary of State? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—" I have already replied to it."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" What is his reply to the question whether a communication to that effect has or has not been sent to the Government of India or the Secretary of State? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—" I am not in a position to reply to the question."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" Is the information confidential? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—" Yes, until orders are passed. The matter is now under consideration."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" With reference to the question on the same subject put by me on the 5th August last, the Council Secretary to my hon. Friend asked for notice. Now that notice has been given, I should like to know whether any such communication has been sent or not? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—" I am not aware of any notice having been given."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I ask whether the hon. Minister denies that any such communication was sent to the Government of India or the Secretary of State? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—" I have already answered that, Sir."

Delay in filling the post of the Director of Agriculture.

* 512 Q.—Mr. V. T. ARASU: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state why there is delay in the appointment of a permanent successor to Mr. Hilson, the late Director of Agriculture?

A.—Because the Government are considering the question.

2nd November 1931]

Restrictions on the promotion of agricultural graduates holding the B.Sc. degree.

* 513 Q.—**MR. A. B. SHETTY**: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state whether there is any proposal to shut out agricultural graduates holding the B.Sc. degree from the gazetted rank in the Science section of the department, unless they are Honours B.A.'s or M.A.'s?

A.—No.

Education

Preparatory class in the Widows' Home, Triplicane.

* 514 Q.—**MR. M. B. RANGASWAMI REDDI**: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) whether there was a preparatory class attached to the Widows' Home, Triplicane, under Government management and control with a tutor sanctioned for the class;

(b) when the class and the post of tutor were abolished and why they were abolished;

(c) whether Sister R. S. Subbulakshmi Ammal, Superintendent of the Widows' Home, continued this class under her management and control and also threw it open to day scholars;

(d) whether she had the sanction of Government for managing these classes and holding them in the Widows' Home;

(e) whether it is a fact that Government scholarships were sanctioned for the pupils of these classes and if so, how many of each kind were sanctioned during each of these years;

(f) whether it is a fact that Government scholarships are not tenable in unrecognized schools or classes and, if so, how and why such scholarships were sanctioned for pupils reading in these classes;

(g) who is responsible for this irregularity and what is the total amount expended on this account till now;

(h) whether any applications for Government scholarships on behalf of these pupils have been received and whether it is proposed to sanction them this year too;

(i) whether there is any proposal to accord official sanction for conducting these classes privately this year and taking them over under Government management from next year;

(j) whether the reasons that led to the abolition of these classes and their teacher before have now ceased to operate and, if so, in what manner; and

(k) how many of the girls who studied in these classes in 1930–31 were admitted into the College this year and how many were refused admission?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The post of tutor was abolished on 1st March 1925 as it was considered unnecessary. The class continued.

(c) Yes. Day scholars were occasionally admitted.

(d) No.

[2nd November 1931]

(e) Yes; figures for the last three years are given below:—

	Widow scholarships.	Residential scholarships for unmarried non-Brahman Hindu girls.
1928-29	...	4
1929-30	...	10
1930-31	...	4

(f) Any poor inmates of the Ice House Hostel were eligible for the scholarships in question.

(g) Does not arise.

(h) Yes; the applications are under consideration.

(i) & (j) The question is under consideration.

(k) Eighteen girls who received private tuition were admitted into the Secondary school attached to the College and none were refused admission.

Selection grade for college assistant professors in the Subordinate Educational Service.

* 515 Q.—Mr. K. SINGAM AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) whether college assistant professors in the Subordinate Educational Service have a selection grade of only 5 per cent, whereas school assistants have it to the extent of 25 per cent of their cadre;

(b) whether the starting pay of the two sets of officers is the same and also their qualifications; and

(c) if not, what is the object of having the same maximum pay for both?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) Neither the starting pay nor the qualifications prescribed for appointment are the same.

(c) The assumption that the maximum pay is the same in both cadres is not correct.

Proposed shifting of the Government Training School for Muhammadan Mistresses, Guntur.

* 516 Q.—Khan Bahadur YAHYA. ALI SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government Training School for Muhammadan Mistresses, Guntur, is proposed to be shifted from its present premises to another building and if so, for what reasons; and

(b) whether the inspecting authorities have received representations to the effect that the present premises being situated in the heart of Muhammadan quarters is admirably suited for the school, and that the transference thereof to another place will impair the usefulness and popularity of the institution and seriously affect the strength and attendance in the Model section?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government do not propose to transfer the school from its present premises.

2nd November 1931]

Excise

*Declaration of policy by the Government to introduce
total prohibition in twenty years.*

* 517 Q.—MR. P. BAYAPPA REDDI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have declared to bring about total prohibition in this Presidency within a period of twenty years, and if so, from what date; and

(b) whether this declaration had been kept in view by the Government in their excise policy, and if so, whether the Government will furnish a statement of the endeavours they have made till now to fulfil their pledge to carry out their declared policy towards total prohibition in twenty years?

A.—(a) & (b) While the Government have accepted prohibition as an ideal to work up to, they have not laid down any definite period for the achievement of such a goal. The Government are in pursuance of this policy restricting facilities for obtaining drink, such as reducing the number of shops, reducing the limit of private possession, raising the duties on liquor, restricting the hours of sale, and so on and are introducing schemes of partial prohibition in selected areas. Such partial prohibition has been introduced in selected areas in Tanjore, Tinnevely, Ramnad, Salem and Nilgiri districts.

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—“ May I ask whether the Government expect that the steps that they are taking will result in total prohibition of liquor in 20 years? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—“ The Legislative Council have passed the resolution and Government are trying to carry it out as far as possible. Nobody can say what will happen in the next 20 years. ”

*Deputation to the Collector of Anantapur to introduce prohibition
in certain areas.*

* 518 Q.—MR. P. BAYAPPA REDDI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) whether more than 800 people representing the Tarimala group of villages waited on deputation on the Collector of Anantapur, Rai Bahadur N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar, to request him to enquire and recommend their villages for prohibition;

(b) whether the Collector of Anantapur after enquiry closed the arrack shops with the sanction of the Excise Commissioner from 1st April 1931;

(c) whether the Collector recommended the closure of the toddy shops also within the area from 1st October after the expiry of their lease term on the 30th September;

[2nd November 1931]

(d) whether the Excise Commissioner accepted the recommendation; and

(e) when the proposal for declaring the Tarimala group of villages for 'prohibition' reached the Government?

A.—(a) It is reported that a deputation waited on the Collector in the matter.

(b) The two arrack shops in the Tarimala area were closed temporarily from 1st April 1931.

(c) Yes.

(d) The Commissioner did not object to the Collector's proposal being accepted.

(e) On 6th July 1931.

Deputation from the Tarimala group of villages to the Excise Minister for the introduction of prohibition.

* 519 Q.—MR. P. BAYAPPA REDDI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) whether deputations from the Tarimala group of villages and Peddavadugur group waited upon him on the 26th June when he visited Anantapur and represented their respective cases for prohibition; and

(b) whether the hon. Minister, in consultation with the Collector, promised favourable consideration of their prayers?

A.—(a) Yes, but the date appears to have been the 20th or 21st June.

(b) The best consideration was promised.

Postponement of the auction-sale of toddy and arrack shops in the Gooty and Anantapur taluks.

* 520 Q.—MR. P. BAYAPPA REDDI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) whether the auction-sales of the toddy shops in Gooty and Anantapur taluks were postponed from July to an indefinite date, pending the orders of Government on the recommendation of the District Officers and the Revenue Board;

(b) whether a District Gazette notification was issued fixing the dates of auction of the toddy shops of these two taluks to August;

(c) whether the present Collector Sriman D. Mahanti Mahasayo issued a District Gazette notification, dated 20th September, that the sales of the toddy shops in Gooty and Anantapur taluks would be held on the 5th and 7th October respectively, excepting the shops in Peddavadugur and Tarimala areas;

(d) whether the Collector issued cyclostyled circulars of the above notification to all the village officers also;

2nd November 1931]

(e) whether a telegraph order of Government was sent to the Collector on 30th September 1931, intimating that the Government had rejected the recommendations for closing the shops in the said two taluks and ordered their sales also; and

(f) whether the Government will be pleased to lay on the table the order of the Government and all the connected papers?

A.—(a) The auction sales were postponed pending the orders of Government regarding the closure of toddy shops in certain areas of the Gooty and Anantapur taluks.

(b) The Collector fixed the auction of toddy shops in the Gooty taluk for 27th July 1931 and that of the toddy shops in Anantapur taluk for 3rd August 1931.

(c) & (d) The Government have not the information.

(e) No telegraphic order was sent to the Collector by the Government on the subject.

(f) The Government do not consider that any useful purpose will be served by placing the papers on the table of the House.

Estimated fall in the Excise revenue of the Nellore district.

* 521 Q.—Khan Bahadur YAHYA ALI SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) to what extent the toddy and arrack sales in Nellore district have been successful; and

(b) what the fall in the Excise revenue of the district will be during the current year?

A.—(a) & (b) The rentals realized by the sale of arrack shops in the Nellore district for the lease year which commenced on 1st April 1931 showed a fall of 41.4 per cent as compared with the rentals for 1930–31. The Government have called for a report in respect of the other points.

Fisheries

Aid to fishermen associations engaged in socio-economic work.

* 522 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) whether there are any associations of fishermen on the West Coast engaged in socio-economic work;

(b) whether the Fisheries department is giving grants for them;

(c) whether the Sree Gnanodaya Samaj, Mangalore, at any time applied for grant and if so, what the orders of Government are; and

[2nd November 1931]

(d) whether Government have under consideration proposals to encourage indigenous organizations engaged in uplift work among fishermen by making grants as is done by the Labour department?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) The Sree Gnanodaya Samaj was paid a total sum of Rs. 2,345 (Rs. 750 in 1917-18 and Rs. 1,595 in 1920-21) for the construction of a Temperance Hall.

(d) No.

Industries

Definition of 'Cottage industries.'

* 523 Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state whether the Government have amended the definition of the term 'Cottage industries' and if so, how?

A.—No.

Government Industrial School, Bellary.

* 524 Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) when the Government Industrial School was actually started in Bellary;

(b) the number of pupils and the strength of the clerical and the teaching establishment in the first year of its working and the number of classes that had then to be attended to; and

(c) the present strength of the school and the number of classes requiring attention now and if there has been increase in both whether the clerical and teaching establishment has been adequately strengthened to cope with the additional work and if so, the additions made to the respective establishments and if not, why not?

A.—(a) Started regular work from 8th July 1929.

(b) Number of pupils admitted 27

Number of pupils at the end of the year 22

The following staff was sanctioned for the school:—

One Superintendent on Rs. 200—20—500.

One cabinet-making instructor on Rs. 40—2½—60.

One smithy instructor on Rs. 40—2½—60.

One clerk—Storekeeper on Rs. 35—60.

The number of classes to be attended to were two, one in cabinet-making and the other in smithy work.

2nd November 1931]

- (c) Number of pupils at the end of 1930-31 was 42. The number of classes requiring attention was five, first and second year classes in cabinet-making, first and second year classes in smithy and a motor car driving and mechanism course started in 1930.

The following staff was sanctioned to cope with the additional work.

One lecturer in motor work on Rs. 125-7-175 and one storekeeper on Rs. 35-60.

Reduction in the rate of stipends to pupil teachers.

* 524-A Q.—MR. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) whether Government have ordered with retrospective effect a reduction in the rates of stipends and stipendiary grants to women and men teachers under training in the current year;

(b) if so, what amount per month the Secondary Grade, Higher and Lower Elementary Grade pupil teachers will get from this month onwards;

(c) how the modified rate of stipends compares with the former rates;

(d) whether any representation has been made to the Government to the effect that the second year students may be given stipends at the usual rates till December and discharged that month and that their final examination may be held in January; and

(e) whether the Government have considered any other way of giving relief to poor pupil teachers who are entirely depending on the stipends they get?

A.—(a) Yes. A reduction of 25 per cent.

(b) & (c) A statement^a showing the rates of stipends in force till the end of last year and the rates at which the stipends are granted from October 1931 is placed on the table.

(d) No.

(e) No.

MR. A. B. SHETTY:—"Are the Government aware that many of these pupil teachers depend entirely on their stipends and the effect of this reduction with retrospective effect will be to compel many of them to give up their training course and go home?"

THE HON. DIWAN BAHADUR S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"I am not sure that will be the result. But national emergency justifies such a course."

MR. A. B. SHETTY:—"Will the Government consider whether they cannot, at least in the case of the second year students, give the usual stipends till December and then discharge them at once and hold their final examination in January?"

[2nd November 1931]

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"Orders have already been issued and stipends are being paid at 75 per cent of the old rates. I do not think it is possible to revise the orders now."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Is it a fact that the national finances have come to such a low level that it is necessary to close all the educational institutions?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"We have not come to such a stage as to be under the necessity of closing all educational institutions."

Irrigation

Stoppage of irrigation facilities for lands under the Red Hills.

* 524-B Q.—Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received a petition from the ryots under the Red Hills Tank, dated 14th October 1931 and also a letter from the President, Red Hills Tank P.R.R. Association, dated 27th idem complaining against the stoppage of water for irrigation of the samba crop from the 15th October 1931 and requesting the withdrawal of the order stopping the supply of water;

(b) whether water in the Red Hills Tank had attained the full tank level (44.67 feet) on the 15th October 1931 and whether the surplus water received from the supply channels is now being allowed to waste down the anicut;

(c) why under the above circumstances the supply of water for irrigation of the samba crop under the Red Hills Tank ayacut was cut off on the 15th October by the P.W.D. Overseer of the tank though water for irrigation of the samba crop was issued from the 1st September up to 14th October;

(d) whether it is the intention of the Government to cut off all supplies for irrigation of the samba crop in succession for two months from the 15th October to 15th December and if so, what provision has been made to enable the ryots to raise the samba crop especially in view of the failure of the North-East Monsoon this year;

(e) whether the Government propose to compensate the ryots for the loss to be incurred by them by the failure of the samba crop;

(f) whether the temporary rules for the regulation of water supply from the Red Hills and Cholavaram tanks issued by Government in G.O. No. 2047-I., dated the 22nd August 1928 were passed by the Government in the interest of the Madras City water supply or to enable the execution of the works in connection with the improvements to Tamarapauk Anicut Head sluice and upper supply channel;

(g) whether it is a fact that last year water was allowed for irrigation from the 15th October to 15th December as water in the Red Hills Tank had reached the full tank level and why the same procedure was not adopted this year as well; and

2nd November 1931]

(h) why, if it was the intention of Government to stop this year all supplies for irrigation for two months in succession for the samba crop, the ryots were not warned in due time and prevented from cultivating the crop? "

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The level on 14th October 1931 was 44.67 feet but the Government have no information whether water was being wasted over the anicut.

(c) The issue of water for irrigation was stopped under the rules in force.

(d) Orders have been issued authorizing the issue of water for irrigation from 28th October.

(e) No.

(f) The order regulated the issue of water with regard to the interests both of the City water supply and of irrigation.

(g) Last year water was allowed for irrigation from 31st October. This year it has been allowed from 28th October.

(h) The ryots are aware of the rules and the risk involved.

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" With reference to the answer to clause (c), may I know whether the rules contemplate the stoppage of water even when the tank has reached the full tank level? Why was water stopped between the 14th and 28th of October when it was ordered to be issued again for irrigation purposes? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" Notice, Sir."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" Will the Government consider the desirability of supplying water for irrigation purposes invariably after the full tank level is reached? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" The Government will consider the suggestion, Sir."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I ask whether it is right on the part of the Government to allow the ryots to sow the samba crop and then stop the water? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" Notice, Sir."

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR:—" With reference to the answer to clause (b), may I know why Government have not called for the information? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" Because Government did not think it necessary to call for the information."

[2nd November 1931]

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS**Legislative Council***Appointment of Council Secretaries.*

525 Q.—Mr. C. BASU DEV: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

- (a) when the present Council Secretaries were appointed;
- (b) what is the nature of the work they have so far done; and
- (c) the sums they have each drawn for each month on account of travelling allowance since their appointment?

A.—(a) Messrs. T. Sundara Rao Nayudu, M.L.C., and R. Madanagopal Nayudu, M.L.C., assumed charge of the office of Council Secretary on the afternoon of the 12th January 1931, and Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib, M.L.C., assumed charge on the afternoon of the 16th January 1931.

- (b) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to page 138 of Volume II of the Madras Legislative Council Manual which gives the duties of the Council Secretaries.
- (c) The Government have no information but will call for it.

Prisons*Viswabrahman convicts and facilities to preserve their orthodox.*

526 Q.—Pandit GANALA RAMAMURTI: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware of the fact that the Viswabrahman community as a class does not take food and water from anybody's hands except cooked by themselves;

(b) whether it was brought to the notice of the Government that a separate kitchen including brass vessels for eating and drinking purposes may be supplied to the Viswabrahman convicts as is done to Brahman prisoners; and

(c) the orders of the Government regarding this request?

A.—(a) The Government have no information.

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise.

Economic Condition*Economic condition of the ryots of the districts of Kistna, Godavari East and Godavari West.*

527 Q.—Mr. C. SATYANARAYANA CHOUDARI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have called for reports from the district authorities of Kistna, West and East Godavari on the present economic condition of the ryots of these districts;

2nd November 1931]

(b) whether they propose to collect the enhanced taxes in these districts in 1932; and

(c) what steps they have taken or propose to take to give relief to ryots in distress on account of the economic depression?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) & (c) The questions will be considered on receipt of the reports called for.

Public Health

Water-supply scheme for Tuticorin municipality.

528 Q.—MR. A. P. L. N. V. NADIMUTHU PILLAI: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) when the question of water-supply scheme for the Tuticorin municipality was taken up for consideration by Government;

(b) when the plans and estimates were prepared and when they were sanctioned by the Government; and

(c) if the scheme has not yet been completed, what the reasons are for the delay?

A.—(a) The question of a water-supply scheme for Tuticorin has been engaging the attention of the Government for over half a century.

(b) Plans and estimates for a complete water-supply scheme were prepared in the year 1915 and sanctioned in the year 1918. A revised estimate amounting to Rs. 27.83 lakhs was prepared and sanctioned in the year 1926.

(c) New engines indented for have to be erected; the elevated reinforced concrete reservoir is under construction; re-testing and re-joining the mains of the distribution system and some other subsidiary work have to be done. All these are expected to be completed by about June 1932.

Delay in the execution of the water-supply scheme for Tuticorin municipality.

529 Q.—MR. DANIEL THOMAS: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Tuticorin municipality has been collecting a heavy tax from the year 1915 for a protected scheme of water-supply to the town;

(b) whether the works pertaining to the scheme finally sanctioned by the Government in 1926 are still pending completion;

(c) whether the Government have investigated into the delay in the execution of the works and what steps have been or proposed to be taken to complete the works without further delay; and

(d) when the Government expect the works will be completed and handed over to the municipality?

[2nd November 1931]

A.—(a) The Tuticorin Municipal Council was levying water-supply and drainage tax at the rate of 8 to 9 per cent per annum between the years 1915 and 1924. The tax was suspended in the year 1924–25. The Municipal Council has since been levying the tax at the rate of $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes. The Chief Engineer has been asked to see that the remaining works are carried out expeditiously and that no avoidable delays are allowed to occur.

(d) About June 1932.

Education

Alleged running of certain classes for the Sarada Vidyalaya in the Widows' Home.

530 Q.—Mr. M. B. RANGASWAMI REDDI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that Sister Subbalakshmi Ammal has been running a certain number of classes in the Widows' Home under her own private management and control;

(b) whether she has obtained the previous permission of Government for running these classes in addition to her work for Sarada Vidyalaya, Mylapore, for which she has been honorary correspondent; and

(c) whether the sanction of Government has been obtained for holding these classes in the Home and if so, what rent is paid by her therefor?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) No. No rent has ever been collected.

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

NON-OFFICIAL BUSINESS.

II.—BILLS.

(1) THE NAMBUDIRI BILL.

11-45 a.m. * The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The House will now resume consideration of the motion on the Nambudiri Bill."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Sir, with reference to this Bill, as in the case of my Friend, Mr. Narayanan Nambiyar's Bill, I have given notice of an exactly similar amendment, namely, that this Bill No. 14 of 1931 of Mr. Madhusoodhanan Thangal be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon. I move that amendment.

2nd November 1931] [Sir M. Krishnan Nayar]

‘As I said, with reference to the Bill of my hon. Friend, Mr. Narayanan Nambiyar, this Bill also deals with social legislation. My hon. Friend, Mr. Madhusoodhanan Thangal, proposes to introduce, by his Bill, some drastic changes in the customs that now govern the community. For instance, in this community of the Nambudiri, as in the case of people following the Marumakkattayam Law, the Law of partition does not obtain. One of the chapters included in the Bill of my hon. Friend, Mr. Madhusoodhanan Thangal, enables individual members of the family to claim a partition in the family property. As I said with reference to the Bill of my hon. Friend, Mr. Narayanan Nambiyar, with regard to this Bill also, the Government do not wish to say anything about the desirability or otherwise of introducing this measure. The Government want to have the opinions of the members of the community. I am not referring to all the changes that my hon. Friend wants to introduce by the Bill. My hon. Friend, Mr. Madhusoodhanan Thangal, wants to introduce, in certain respects, the Mithakshara Law of Inheritance among these classes of people who are now not governed by that Law. With reference to that point also, the Government wish to have information. For these and other reasons, I move my amendment. With reference to this amendment also as in the case of my amendment to the Bill of my hon. Friend, Mr. Narayanan Nambiyar, I can give this undertaking on behalf of the Government, viz., that we shall get the information as early as possible, in any case, before the 10th January 1932. In view of these observations of mine, I hope the hon. Member will not press his amendment.’

Khan Bahadur MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur:—“I second this amendment.”

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—“Sir, I beg to move the following amendment—

‘that the Nambudiri Bill (Bill No. 14 of 1931) of Mr. P. Madhusoodhanan Thangal be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon and that such opinion be obtained and placed on the table of the House before the next meeting of the Council.’

“The hon. the Law Member has, of course, given us the assurance that he will have the Bill circulated and get the opinions before the 10th January next. But I do not know whether the Legislative Council Office or the Secretariat department is going to get the reports from the Collectors and other people. In order to give a direction to the Legislative Department to place the opinion on the table of the House before the next meeting, this motion is absolutely necessary. With that object I move this motion.”

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—“I second this motion.”

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“Sir, I may assure my hon. Friend that the Council Office and the Government Secretariat are working in co-operation in matters like these. But if my hon. Friend is very particular about this amendment being passed, I have no objection. The amendment wants that the opinion must be obtained and placed on the table of the House before the next meeting. Opinions can certainly be obtained by that time and the Government

[Sir M. Krishnan Nayar] [2nd November 1931]

will make an earnest attempt to place them on the table of the House. But the date of the next meeting has not yet been definitely settled and there may be some difficulty."

The motion of the hon. the Law Member was by leave withdrawn.

The motion of Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan was put and carried.

(2) THE TIRUMALAI-TIRUPATI DEVASTHANAMS BILL.

*Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—" Mr. President, Sir, I move that the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill^a (Bill No. 15 of 1931), and move that it be referred to the same Select Committee as the one to which the Bill of Mr. Manikkavelu Nayakar has been referred."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" I second the motion."

The motion was put and carried.

(3) THE MARUMAKKATTAYAM BILL.

* Mr. R. M. PALAT:—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move that the Marumakkattayam Bill^a (Bill No. 20 of 1931) be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members:—

- (1) The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.
- (2) The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
- (3) Dr. P. Subbarayan.
- (4) Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.
- (5) Mr. C. Krishnan.
- (6) Mr. P. Madhusoodhanan Thangal.
- (7) Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib.
- (8) B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur.
- (9) Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar.
- (10) Mr. A. B. Shetty.
- (11) Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.
- (12) Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
- (13) Mr. F. E. James.
- (14) Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapaty Mudaliyar.
- (15) Mover.

"As has already been mentioned in this Council last Saturday, this is not the first time that a Bill to alter the Marumakkattayam Law has been before the House. Marumakkattayam Law is the system of law by which rights to property are governed by and solely by relationships traced through females. The essence of inheritance in this system is descent from a female as distinct from descent from a male.

"The late Mr. Justice Muthuswami Ayyar in his memorandum as President of the Malabar Marriage Commission of 1890 describes the Marumakkattayam family or tarwad as follows:—

'It consists of several mothers and children and their descendants in the female line all tracing their descent from a common female ancestor and living

^a Published in the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 18th August 1931.

2nd November 1931]

[Mr. R. M. Palat]

together as a joint family in subjection to the power and under the guidance and control of the senior male for the time being as its head or representative. The link of relationship is descent from a common female ancestor and the bond of family union is subject to a common karnavan. The notion of tarwad property is that the entire family is the owner and that it is impartible except by common consent and that each individual member is entitled to be maintained in his or her tarwad home and to the fruits of joint beneficial enjoyment. The joint family is called a tarwad and each of the mothers and her children and descendants in the female line constituting the tarwad is called a Taivali or the line of a single mother. It is noteworthy that the relation of husband and wife or father and child is not inherent in the conception of a Marumakkattayam family.'

'This is the system of law followed by the ancient ruling families in Malabar, whether Nayars or not, by the leading Mappilla and Thiyya families and their allied castes and by certain Nambudiri Brahmans. This present Bill is confined to certain sections of the non-Brahman Hindus in Malabar and South Kanara. I need not trouble this House with any attempt to show how or why this system became the law among the dominant castes in Malabar and South Kanara. Suffice it to say that whatever the origin of the system, reasons no longer exist for its continuance in its present stage.

'The usage has long ago departed from it except in the tarwads of the ancient chieftains, and a few others with similar pretensions. We see in Sir Muthuswami Ayyar's memorandum:—

'It is noteworthy that the relation of husband and wife or father and child is not inherent in the conception of a Marumakkattayam family,'

while in practice this relationship has become inherent in the people. This is not compatible with the principles of Marumakkattayam. Again, it is not, as Mr. Justice Muthuswami Ayyar says, the descendants of a common female ancestor with subordinate branches or tavazhis of that female and her children who now live together; but the family now more often consists of a father or husband, wife and children living separate from the tarwad. The senior male is not now, as the Judge says, the real head as the females do not live with him but with the husband and the father. The members often do not live under his control and guidance, as he himself often lives away from the tarwad with his wife and children and the other junior male members follow this practice or bring their wives into the tarwad house and the women also live apart with their husbands. They are not therefore maintained in the tarwad home. The learned Judge says, they are entitled to joint beneficial enjoyment. They can generally get it only by litigation.

'Mr. Mayne stated as follows in the preface to his book on Hindu Law:—

'Even in Malabar I have witnessed continued efforts on the part of the natives to cast off their own customs and to deal with their property by partition, alienation, and devise as if it were governed by the ordinary Hindu Law. These efforts were constantly successful in the provincial courts but were invariably foiled on appeal to the Sudder Court at Madras, the objection being frequently taken for the first time by an English Barrister. It so happened that, during the whole time of this silent revolt, the Sudder Court possessed one or more Judges, who were thoroughly acquainted with Malabar customs, and by whom cases from that district were invariably heard. Had the Court been without such special experience, the process would probably have gone on with such rapidity that, by this time, every Malabar tarwad would have been broken up. The revolt would have been a revolution.'

[Mr. R. M. Palat] [2nd November 1931]

"This was in 1878. Even by then, Marumakkattayam had begun to be unsatisfactory and it was the English courts that, against the wish of the people, crystallized the then existing customs. I do not blame the courts because it was their duty to administer the law as it stood and not to legislate. Quarrels among the tavazhis and between the karnavan and the members have become incessant and life made unbearable to such an extent that, except from a few karnavans, there is an insistent and strong demand for immediate partition.

12 noon. "The Malabar Marriage Commission of 1890 states the position thus:—

'It (meaning the tarwad) huddles together as a family, a number of distant relatives not necessarily drawn to each other by any bond or affection. It makes home life in the best sense of the word impossible, for the father is a casual visitor and the mother and children are but units in a heterogenous flock dependent on a practically irresponsible guardian who from the mere accident of his being the eldest of the flock is expected to be able to regard every member with an impartial love and to prefer their interests to those of the wife of his bosom and the children of his loins. While attempting to maintain the impartibility of family property, it has been unable to prevent such property from being encumbered in every possible way and the effort to get rid of the encumbrances demoralizes the people to such an extent that Malabar has become notorious for forgery, perjury and reckless litigation. The rule which vests the management of the tarwad property in the eldest male, raises a man to power when he is in his dotage and creates a constant conflict between duty and interest, and by way of climax to the many temptations which invite him to provide for his wife and children by malversation and breach of trust offers him the assurance that he cannot be called to account. Finally, by declaring the right of every member to receive maintenance from the tarwad, from the womb to the grave, junior members are encouraged to pass useless lives in sloth and idleness without effort to better their condition.'

"Such is the picture of the tarwad, as drawn by the Malabar Marriage Commission.

"The conflict between interest and duty arising from the growth of these sentiments and usage cannot be better set forth than in the passage I have already read out. It is now sought to remedy this state of affairs by legislation. In Cochin and Travancore the change in the custom has been recognized and a National Legislature has given effect to it. This Bill follows that legislation. It is a measure of very moderate reform. It enables members of a family to partition from their tarwad subject to this proviso that no member could partition from his branch of the family, during the lifetime of the common ancestress of that branch except with the consent of such ancestress. I have introduced this clause following the precedent existing in Cochin and formerly in Travancore where I understand the law has since been changed and individual partition allowed. In advocating taivali partition in preference to individual partition, I have also been influenced by the pronouncement of Mr. Strange in his Hindu Law that taivali partition was the original basis of partition. The general demand in Malabar goes further than my Bill and demands individual partition as, witness the articles which have been appearing in such Malayalam papers as the *Manorama* and the *Mathrubhumi*, but here besides the example of the Native States, I have acted on the principle that half a loaf is better than no loaf and adopted this expedient to placate the opinion among the elders and to proceed along the line of least

2nd November 1931] [Mr. R. M. Palat]

resistance. Again, not to antagonise a certain section of public opinion, I have, on the Cochin and Travancore precedents, exempted certain specific families, such as the Malikhana holders and a few others from the operation of this Bill.

"Although this motive and the Travancore and Cochin example have influenced me in exempting these families, still the chief reason that has guided me in exempting them is that among them the ladies still live in their tarwad houses and are visited by their husbands and that they have not yet begun to live with or visit their husband's homes. Therefore, since the idea of the paternal family is still undeveloped among them, there is neither so much discontent nor demand for reform among them as among the general body of the followers of Marumakkattayam Law.

"This Bill differs from Nambiyar's Bill in that I exclude from the operation of my Bill these families and that I do not deal with marriage. I was glad to note yesterday that Mr. Nambiyar is willing to meet me on the first point. I believe that every Member of this Council either from Malabar or South Kanara, whose community is affected by this Bill is in favour of the changes proposed, and I trust, therefore, that the House would see that no obstacles are placed in the way and that this greatly needed reform is quickly passed into law. In taking this course, the House would merely be following its usual custom of letting through such legislation as is demanded by the community concerned."

Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON:—"I second it, Sir."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Sir, I move the amendment which stands in my name, viz:—

'that the Marumakkattayam Bill (Bill No. 20 of 1931) of Mr. R. M. Palat be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon.'

"My reasons are the same as those which I gave in connexion with my Friend, Mr. Narayanan Nambiyar's Bill. Practically the most important portion of my Friend Mr. Palat's Bill is that which relates to partition, and that is one of the subjects dealt with in Mr. Nambiyar's Bill. So, for the same reasons which I gave at the time when Mr. Nambiyar moved his Bill, I move this amendment."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I second it, Sir."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Sir, I move the amendment that stands in my name, that—

'the Marumakkattayam Bill (Bill No. 20 of 1931) of Mr. R. M. Palat be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon and that such opinion be obtained and placed on the table of the House before the next meeting of the Council.'"

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"I second it."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I accept that amendment, Sir, and withdraw mine."

The hon. the Law Member's amendment was by leave withdrawn.

[2nd November 1931]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I shall now put the amendment of Mr. Hameed Khan to the vote of the House. The question is:—

'that the Marumakkattayam Bill (Bill No. 20 of 1931) of Mr. R. M. Palat be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon and that such opinion be obtained and placed on the table of the House before the next meeting of the Council'."

The motion was carried.

(4) THE TIRUMALAI-TIRUPATI DEVASTHANAMS BILL.

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"Mr. President, Sir, I move that the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill^a (Bill No. 18 of 1931) be referred to the same Select Committee that was appointed for Bill No. 17 of 1931 of my Friend Mr. Manikkavelu Nayakar."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"I second it."

The question was put to the House and carried and the Bill was referred to the same Select Committee.

(5) A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920, AND THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, 1920.

Mr. F. BIRLEY:—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, and the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"I second the motion."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. F. BIRLEY:—"Mr. President, I beg to introduce the Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, and the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920."

THE VISWAKARMAN CHILDREN'S BILL.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Pandit Ganala Ramamurti."

(The hon. Member was not in his place.)

A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS CITY MUNICIPAL ACT, 1919.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar."

(The hon. Member was not in his place.)

(6) A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920, AND THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, 1920.

Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, and the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920."

Mr. P. C. MOSES:—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"I now introduce the Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, and the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920."

^a Published in the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 18th August 1931.

2nd November 1931]

A BILL TO AMEND THE ANDHRA UNIVERSITY ACT, 1925, AS AMENDED BY
ACT VI OF 1929.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Mr. Mahboob Ali Baig."
(The hon. Member was not in his place.)

(7) A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920,
AND THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, 1920.

Mr. F. E. JAMES:—" Mr. President, I move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, and the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920."

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. F. E. JAMES:—" Sir, I beg to introduce the Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, and the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920."

(8) A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920,
AND THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, 1920.

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, and the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" Sir, I now introduce the Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, and the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920."

(9) A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS CHILDREN ACT, 1920.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—" Mr. President, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Madras Children Act, 1920."

Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR:—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—" Sir, I now introduce the Bill to amend the Madras Children Act, 1920."

III.—RESOLUTIONS ON MATTERS OF GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST.

(1) POSTPONEMENT OF THE PROPOSAL FOR ENHANCEMENT OF
ASSESSMENT IN MALABAR.

* Mr. R. M. PALAT:—" Sir, I move the following resolution:—

' This Council recommends to the Government that the consideration of the proposal of the Special Settlement Officer as approved by the Board of Revenue for enhancement of assessment in Malabar be postponed until normal conditions are restored '.

[Mr. R. M. Palat]

[2nd November 1931]

“Sir, I have brought forward this resolution as it is iniquitous in the present state of the country that Malabar should be subject to any fresh enhancement of revenue.

“We see the Royal Commission on Decentralization in 1909 recommending that the general principles of assessment should be embodied in legislation instead of being left to executive discretion. Then we have the minute of dissent by the Indian Member of the Government of India in 1919, advocating the substitution of legislation for executive order in cases of enhancement of land revenue and the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Indian Reforms in 1919 in its Report strongly advocates the same course. Attempts were made by various Provincial Governments to carry out this suggestion. So far as I know, only the United Provinces Government has succeeded in this. In Madras, the proposals were so unsatisfactory that this Council rejected the Bill on the 24th March 1924.

12-15
P.M.

“The Council was perfectly justified in doing so as the Bill which the then Revenue Member, Sir Arthur Knapp, tried to introduce in this Council omitted certain vital provisions which had been approved of by a committee consisting of, among others, his predecessor in office, Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah, and such experienced revenue officials as Mr. Macmichael. Sir, this Bill merely sought to codify the existing Revenue Board rules and gave the Council no control over this method of taxation and so was in spirit opposed to the recommendations made by the Joint Parliamentary Committee, that those who are taxed must have a voice in their taxation. Sir, land revenue is the largest head of revenue in this province and this Council is allowed no voice whatever in either its imposition or its regulation. According to the Government's own confession it takes 50 per cent of the landlord's share, a share which the Government would never dream of taking from a merchant. My first argument therefore is that before the legislature carries out the intentions of the Joint Parliamentary Committee as accepted by the Government, there should be no resettlement. Resettlement operations in Malabar should not be given effect to. This is an argument which applies not only to Malabar but to all the districts in this Presidency.

“My second argument is that Malabar is so poor that there should be no resettlement now. Sir, I understand that persons like the Zamorin Maharaja and others have sent up petitions to His Excellency the Governor and protested their inability to pay the enhanced assessment. If the Zamorin Maharaja himself is so hard hit, what then is the position of the ordinary ryot? Sir, we see that the Government theory is that it is no concern of the Government to enquire as to how much remains to the ryot after he pays the assessment. This, I see, has been set down in the speech of the then Revenue Member in November, 1928. Sir, the idea seems to be that the joy that the poor ryot has in maintaining the establishment and in paying the allowances and pay of the services should be a sufficient reward to him, and that nothing else is necessary to be done for him. I am glad to say, however, that there seems to be some slight change in this attitude. I am referring to the

2nd November 1931]

[Mr. R. M. Palat]

• note circulated last Saturday explaining the Government's intentions with regard to the Kistna and Godavari resettlement. The Government have expressed therein their willingness to spread over a number of years the proposed enhancement. I claim at least the same consideration for Malabar also as that district is equally hard hit by the prevailing economic depression. Sir, we see Lord Salisbury when he was Secretary of State for India, writing: 'It is not a thrifty policy to draw the mass of the revenue from the rural districts where capital is scarce . . . as India must be bled, the lancet should be directed to the parts where blood is congested or at least sufficient, not to those who are already feeble from want of it'. Sir, the least that the Government could do is to appoint another committee to enquire into the economic condition of Malabar before proceeding any further. If Kistna and Godavari districts can be granted a committee, why not Malabar or any other district where a resettlement is going on or threatened?

"Thirdly, Sir, I submit that both the theory, the pitch, the rates, the method and the time chosen are all wrong. Sir, this 18 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent is, I believe, based on the analogy of what is laid down in the Estates Land Act, where, if I am right, the zamindar is allowed to raise his rent by 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent every 20 years. But, Sir, this can only be done with the consent of the courts. Courts have got power to pronounce on the point whether the increase is justified, whether the landlord is justified in increasing his rent. But in the case of the ordinary ryot, who holds directly under the Government, there is no third party. And it is wrong to treat land in Malabar as Government land, as this is one district perhaps in the whole of India where land has always been acknowledged to be private property. In Malabar land has always been treated as private janmam or private property and not Government land. The Government in following its present system have been collecting rent and therefore denying to the janmi the ownership of land, an ownership always acknowledged. The Government are entitled to collect only a tax and not rent. And again, Sir, in calculating the average for the last thirty years, an elementary sense of justice would have excluded the war years as being in the same category as famine years, and to show the absolutely mechanical character of the administration there can be no better argument than the time they have chosen to introduce their new rates. The Government should not have taken the prices prevailing in those war years and come to its conclusion as to the prosperity of the district. Sir, His Excellency the Governor has in his opening speech in this Council stressed the depression prevailing in this country. But the departments of the Government concerned with the enhancement of the revenue do not yet seem to be aware that there is any depression existing at all.

"My next argument is that the Government are not justified in imposing any resettlement at all. The people of Malabar had always understood that the last settlement was permanent. I asked a question on this subject in the Council on the 29th January, about Mr. Warden's proclamation of the 21st of July 1805. The reply merely referred me to the Settlement Officer's report of this year. The circumstances in

[Mr. R. M. Palat]

[2nd November 1931]

which the proclamation was made prove my contention. Sir Thomas Munro and Col. Read, the authors of the Ryotwari Settlement in this Presidency, have clearly stated that they intended that a settlement should be permanent. We see Sir Thomas Munro stating before the House of Commons 1813: 'The assessment is permanent . . . (the ryot) holds it for ever without any additional assessment'. And again, comparing the Bengal permanent settlement and the Ryotwari settlement, he said, 'With respect to permanency there is no difference, but ryotwari leaves the Government an increasing revenue arising from the waste in proportion to its cultivation'. Again, we see the Board of Revenue saying in 1857: 'A Madras ryot is able to retain his land perpetually without any increase in assessment'. And again in 1862, the Government of Madras wrote to the Government of India, 'There can be no question that one fundamental principle of the ryotwari system is that the Government demand on land is fixed for ever'. That this view was approved and that the Government wanted to introduce permanent settlement is proved by a number of despatches ending with that of the 23rd March 1867 from the then Secretary of State which re-affirms this decision of Her Majesty's Government. It is only as late as 1883 that the Secretary of State in his Despatch No. 24 of 28th March of that year rejects the policy of permanent settlement which had been recommended by two Viceroys of India, Lords Canning and Lawrence, and accepted by two Secretaries of State. Therefore in the light of these, I submit that the interpretation put on the proclamation of 21st July 1805 by the people of Malabar was right, and that the correct view is that the settlement when carried out under the proclamation was a permanent one and that the demand then fixed was unalterable. Again, Sir, in direct violation of the proclamation of the 8th January 1828 by Mr. Sheffield, the Principal Collector of Malabar made with the authority of the Governor in Council which said that 'people may be relieved of all fears on the subject of the reimposition of the tax upon the pepper vine,' we have the present Settlement Officer's statement that pepper gardens are now assessed. Although I have little hope that a Government which has conveniently forgotten its promises and successfully evaded for more than ten years the recommendations of the Joint Parliamentary Committee, would accept this resolution, still I bring this resolution forward in the hope that the House would pass it. With these few words, Sir, I commend this resolution for the acceptance of the House."

Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON:—"Sir, I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution that has been moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Palat. I shall at once come to grips with the Settlement Officer's report and not deal with the ancient history of the settlement of Malabar. Sir, the Special Officer was appointed to consider the question of resettlement in Malabar and Government Order has been issued and circulated to us, and that is G.O. No. 1367, dated 26th June 1931. And in this connection what the Settlement Officer says is as to why assessments can be enhanced in Malabar to the extent of 18 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. The reasons and arguments are contained in various portions of his report and it may be summarised

2nd November 1931] [Mr. K. P. Raman Menon]

as follows. First of all, he says at page 48 of his report, that the deductions have always been favourable to the ryot. Secondly, he says that the prices have in the case of paddy run up to 135 per cent. This is contained at pages 31 and 59 of his report. He says that the prices of coconuts have run up by 71 per cent, and this is contained at page 32 of the report. And the third reason given by him, which is contained at page 48, is this: he has compared the land there with some of the best lands in the Trichinopoly district, Lalgudi taluk, and says that his assistant who compared the lands was of opinion that lands in Malabar, the first-class lands there, are as good as the lands that were found in the Lalgudi taluk. Those were the three main reasons given by the Settlement Officer for saying that Malabar can stand enhancement.

" Dealing with the last reason first, that is, that the lands in Malabar are as good as the lands in the Trichinopoly district, I shall at once say that as a matter of fact there can be no comparison, no historical basis for comparing, of the assessments in Malabar with those in other districts. It would be seen elsewhere from the Settlement Officer's report that land revenue was not one of the systems of revenue that is levied by the ancient Kings of Malabar.

" We were bound to render very little service. We were not bound to pay any land tax at all. We were bound to pay a certain portion and that is the way in which the ancient Kings ruled Malabar. Therefore comparing the taluks of the east coast with that of Malabar is wrong. It has to be seen that all land elsewhere in the Madras Presidency is at the disposal of the Government and belongs to Government, whereas in Malabar it is not so. The lands there are at the disposal of private individuals and not at the disposal of the Government. So that the rate must be necessarily less to the extent that the ownership of land does not vest with the Government. Then the Government Order has considered that the land is as good as any other land in any other district. Does the land belong to Government or the private individual? If the land belongs to Government, you can raise as much taxation as you can, subject to economic conditions. But here in Malabar you cannot raise it to the same extent. Therefore, comparing one district outside Malabar with Malabar is absolutely and fundamentally wrong and the Settlement Officer should not have come to the conclusion he has come to in regard to Malabar. Further I wish to question the statement of the Settlement Officer with regard to the fertility of lands in Malabar. Dealing with the lands in South Kanara he says that the lands higher are not taxed as much as the lands below. He himself says that excessive rains wash out all fertility from the soil and therefore lands are poor in their yield. That is also another aspect that has got to be considered. I am sceptical that lands in Malabar are equal to the lands in Trichinopoly or any other district in the Presidency.

" Then, coming to the other reason given by the Settlement Officer, the Settlement Officer says that prices since the last settlement have gone up, so far as paddy is concerned, 135 per cent. No doubt

[Mr. K. P. Raman Menon] [2nd November 1931]

he is quite correct when he says so. Does the Government not consider that the prices have shown a steady fall? They have gone down 135 per cent. I myself am a small landholder to a certain extent and I remember the days immediately after the settlement when they were selling a cart load from 25 to 30 rupees. After the war for some years paddy was being sold from 80 to 90 rupees. In some cases it went up to Rs. 100. It now has gone down to 25 and 24 rupees and just before I came away from Malabar I had a letter from one of my land agents that the price of paddy is 32. It has come to the 1889 level and I am afraid it will go down lower still because I had information from various parties that prices are going down to 25. If the enhancement of price is a reason for the enhancement of tax at the present time it is quite clear that the enhancement of price is not a safe reason to enhance tax. For, as a matter of fact, we know there is considerable economic depression and nobody can assure anyone else that the depression will come to an end. Therefore, Sir, it is no reason to enhance the rates.

“Coming to coconuts I very well remember that coconut was selling about the time of the previous settlement at 20 rupees per thousand. Prices did go up by 70 to 80 per cent during the war period. Last year it went down to my own knowledge to Rs. 15 per thousand. Now temporarily for the last two months it has gone up to Rs. 32. Last year it was Rs. 20 per thousand. Therefore the reason given with regard to coconut is not sound and that cannot be the reason for raising the tax where lands are planted with coconut gardens. These are the chief sources of income in Malabar. I submit, Sir, therefore there is no valid reason for the enhancement of rates in Malabar.

“Then again the Settlement Officer says that all deductions have been very favourable to the ryots at the previous settlement. We know that the rate of assessment was raised by 77 per cent over the previous rates. A man who paid Rs. 100 was called upon to pay Rs. 177. That was the state of things then. The wonder is probably the spirit that animated our ancestors in 1805 had died down by that time and that was the reason for the increase of rates perhaps in Malabar. The previous attempt was given up on account of the open rebellion in Malabar. Therefore probably in 1902 there was no danger of that recrudescence of crime in Malabar. At page 47, this is what the Settlement Officer says:

‘This procedure was the natural course to adopt in the circumstances, and it would call for no comment if Government’s demand on these excellent southern lands had represented anything like the share that Government could fairly claim. But in fact Government took only a modest part of the share that they could have claimed. It must be remembered that the Malabar settlement succeeded a long period of revenue administration during which the revenue demand was based on recorded extents that bore no resemblance to the actual enjoyment of the ryot; the survey resulted in a proper mapping of the occupation, and Government, faced with a new set of accounts that meant a very large increase in the total beriz of the district, adopted estimates and figures that were at every point most lenient to the ryots; at the request of the Government of India the introduction of the increased demand was only gradually carried out; the result was the heavy concessions under increment remissions to which I have drawn attention in paragraph 25 above.’

2nd November 1931] [Mr. K. P. Raman Menon]

“Then again he observes: ‘I think it is necessary to look at the old settlement calculations in some detail.’ He deals with the same question at page 57, where he says:

‘The proclamation laid down an allowance equal to the seed to cover cultivation expenses; the Malabar Tenancy Committee, which endeavoured to fix a general allowance for expenses that would apply to the district, recommended two and a half times the seed, although they made it clear that this is only an average and cannot be taken as applying to every type of land. In the cases given below I have allowed four times the seed. . . .’

“So that the Settlement Officer himself is prepared to allow four times the seed. Then he takes up particular instances and shows that the Government could have claimed 14 rupees, but the Government was claiming only Rs. 4. This is what he mentioned:

‘In Kunisseri, one of the Palghat desams put by Mr. Stuart in the second group, a flat of 7-2 land, at Rs. 4 an acre for single crop, is admitted to produce 80 paras an acre for first crop. According to Mr. Warden’s formula, we would have to deduct six paras of seed and, as noted above, I am allowing four times the seed as expenses—total 30 paras, leaving a residue of 50 paras. Deducting 16½ paras as the kudyan’s share we get a balance of 33½ paras six-tenths of which is Government’s share—20 paras: at a value in the village during the rrots’ selling months of 14 edangazhis to the rupee (one para contains 10 edangazhis), this is worth over Rs. 14, three and a half times what Government now claims.’

“That is what the Settlement Officer says. We have seen from that that it is based upon the figure of the selling price at Rs. 14 per para. But I have already shown that as a matter of fact the price now is very much below the prices mentioned by the Settlement Officer. As a matter of fact, on the basis of Rs. 30 per cart load, Government could claim Rs. 5 and the Government is claiming that. According to the Special Settlement Officer’s report we are entitled to four times the seed, due cultivation expenses and we are entitled to 15 per cent on account of merchant’s expenses. Taking those figures and working upon them, you will find that the tax that can be levied upon that land taking that the price is Rs. 25, would be Rs. 5 and not more. I do not want to tire you, Sir, by working those figures, but I will convince the hon. Revenue Member that as a matter of fact it will not come to more than Rs. 5. So that, the Government is now taking Rs. 4 and after all there is a slight difference and for that we have to consider the vicissitudes of season which the Settlement Officer himself has considered necessary. As it now stands, it is quite clear that the tax that is being levied on the land is ample, and that we are not in a position to pay more tax is seen from the report. The reasons given by the Settlement Officer, it will thus be seen, are not proper reasons. Prices are so low that people are suffering from want of cash not only in our district, but also elsewhere. This is a most inopportune time for the Government to say that the tax should be paid. Generally officers have to find out some way to recommend the enhancement of tax. In this connexion, Sir, have the Government considered what necessarily would be the deductions that would have to be made for the sustenance of the people living on the land? Is there any opportunity of getting a living wage for the husband, wife and children? Unless and until I find that a certain amount of deduction is made for every man, woman and child in every district as a living wage from the total

[Mr. K. P. Raman Menon] [2nd November 1931]

12-45
P.m.

yield of the land, Government should not collect the rates. Let us take the living wage, whether rich or poor alike, and deduct that first and then strike the balance. From that calculate what is the amount that is due to the Government and convince us that we are liable to pay more, and we will be perfectly willing to pay more. Unless you do that, you cannot merely say that the district can bear an enhancement of $18\frac{3}{4}$ per cent; simply because we were lenient in paying enhanced tax in the past, we cannot be asked to bear a further increase, and we may not be willing to be so lenient in the future. So, that ought not to be the reason for enhancing the tax so far as my district is concerned. At page 38 of his report, the Settlement Officer says:

'These statistics do not seem to me to point to any fair conclusion; it is open to anyone to argue for Malabar as for the Presidency as a whole, that the increase in litigation is a sign of increasing prosperity; it is equally open to anyone else to assert that this increase is simply a regrettable result of the expansion of education.'

"He goes on to observe that as a matter of fact the people are now prosperous and that there is very little of land being sold for payment of arrears of land revenue. I believe, Sir, that the aim of Government is to keep the people prosperous. I believe also, Sir, that the aim of Government is not to drain the last pie of the people. I again believe, Sir, that it is also the aim of Government that the people should not sell away lands to pay land revenue. If you want the people not to sell away lands, if you want to have a contented people, then do not impose further tax, and see that at least the present conditions are maintained. So far as the last assessment was concerned, it was itself a heavy increase, and we bore it patiently for the last thirty years, and in that case the Government were pleased to raise it by easy increments. Added to that, there was also a lucky chance so to say. The big War intervened and sent up the prices very much which eased the situation considerably so far as the selling capacity of the produce was concerned. That is how we tided over the last resettlement. Now, prices are steadily falling, and as a matter of fact there is no possibility of meeting the ordinary demands of the Government, and it will be highly regrettable if the Government does not stay its hands at least for the present. We do not want to condemn out and out the policy of the Government in enhancing the tax. Certainly, we, like every other people in the Presidency, are bound to contribute for the upkeep of the Government. You must also remember that we do not get a single pie back from the Government in the shape of irrigation as compared to other districts. You will be pleased to remember that as a matter of fact when Malabar contributes its revenue it gets nothing in return except good Government. That fact also has to be considered in raising the tax in Malabar. At the present moment, it is very unfortunate to raise the tax in Malabar, and I request the Government through you, Sir, to see if possible not to meddle with the present state of things that are now going on in the district and also to see that the matter is again more fully considered."

2nd November 1931]

* * Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I rise to give my fullest support to the resolution that has been so ably moved and seconded. Because the House is so anxious to reach other important resolutions, I do not wish to add anything more to the sound arguments that have been advanced by the hon. Members who preceded me. I only request the hon. the Revenue Member to recognize the soundness of the arguments that have been put forward.”

* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—“ Mr. President, Sir, the mover of this resolution referred first of all to the recommendation of the Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament that legislation should be introduced regarding the methods of carrying out resettlements of land revenue in this province, and the fact that so far such legislation has not been passed. That, Sir, is a matter which has been referred to on previous occasions in this House, and the House is well aware of the fact that the efforts which were made to introduce legislation which would be acceptable to the Government as well as to the non-official Members of this House have proved infructuous, and it is useless for us—it will be merely a waste of the time of this House—to attempt to introduce further Bills with that object in view. But, Sir, it does not follow from that fact that we should at once abandon our present Policy and cease to deal with resettlement of land revenue in the various districts in turn. The object of the resettlement is to see that as far as possible the incidence of taxation in respect of land is fairly distributed over the various districts of the province. We cannot have a resettlement every year in every district and so we have to carry out resettlement of one district after another so that it comes to the turn of each district once in thirty years or thereabouts, and now that it has come to the turn of Malabar, there is no reason why we should not proceed in the usual manner.

“ We have received a report from the Special Settlement Officer, and that report was published in the District Gazette last January, and criticisms of it were invited. It was stated that if representations were sent in within three months they could be considered by the Government. As a matter of fact, we received no objections whatever within the period mentioned. There have been one or two memorials received since, and I have also received a deputation—of which the hon. Mover was a member—consisting of some janmis of Malabar. I suggested to them that they should put their objections in writing and that they would receive the consideration of Government. So far as I know, we have not received anything in writing from them. The resettlement report was placed on the table of this House last August with a view to giving the Members of this House an opportunity of discussing the Resettlement Officer's proposals, and this resolution is the natural and anticipated outcome of the action of the Government. The Government have not made up their minds as to what action should be taken on the Settlement Officer's report. I can however assure this House that the remarks made by the hon. Members will be very carefully considered by the Government, but I cannot at the present moment make any definite promise as the Government have not

[Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell] [2nd November 1931]

arrived at any definite decision. At the same time, we shall consider the present economic situation in Malabar as elsewhere, and we will in particular consider the suggestion made by the hon. Mover that in view of the present economic situation we should, if we do decide to enhance the rates of land revenue, introduce the enhancement by increments as has been sanctioned in the case of Godavari and Kistna districts. I do not propose to deal in detail with the criticisms of hon. Members and answer them now, but I may say that we will give them very careful consideration."

* Mr. R. M. PALAT:—"Sir, there is just one point I wish to add to what I have already said, and that is, that the revenue rules lay down that second crop could be assessed only if the Government supplies the irrigation water for it. So far as Malabar is concerned, no irrigation water is supplied by the Government except in a very small part of the Palghat taluk, which is practically insignificant and not material to the present case; and again the improvements made by the ryot are assessed in Malabar. The revenue rules say that no improvements should be taxed, unless such improvements are made by the help of the Government. Now suppose single crop land is converted into double crop land, then unless this is due to help by the Government, double crop assessment should not be levied. But that is not what is done in Malabar and when the ryot converts the land without Government help into double crop land, it is assessed for double crop. These are also violations of the rules that I want to expose."

"As to the deputation we led to the hon. the Revenue Member, I may say the main question we were concerned with then was the tenancy question, as also the incidence of taxation and methods of collection; and whether taxation should in the first instance fall on the tenant or the janmi was also touched upon. A general memorandum on the subject is being prepared by the Janmi Association for presentation to Government. I press my resolution, Sir."

The resolution was put and carried.

(2) COMMITTEE TO ENQUIRE INTO MOTOR VEHICLES TAXATION

Mr. F. BIRLEY:—"Mr. President, I beg to move, under Standing Order 33, that items 2 to 15 on the Agenda paper be postponed and that item 16 be taken up immediately."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. F. BIRLEY:—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move the resolution which stands in my name:—

'This Council recommends to the Government that a Committee be appointed to study the whole question of the taxation of motor vehicles in the Presidency, with special reference to—

(a) the incidence of the tax under the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931;

2nd November 1931]

[Mr. F. Birley]

(b) *the licence fees levied by local boards and district municipalities;*

and further, that the Committee be instructed to submit its report before February the 1st, 1932.'

"Mr. President, Sir, I do not propose at this juncture to speak at any length on the subject of my resolution. But I know there are many other speakers who are anxious to speak on it. There has been sufficient evidence before this House of the unsatisfactory incidence of the taxes levied under the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, and the licence fees levied on motor vehicles by local boards and district municipalities in many instances are so heavy as to restrict the healthy growth of mechanical transport as a means of communication in this Presidency. With these few words, I beg to move my resolution."

MR. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Sir, I rise to second the motion moved by Mr. Birley. In doing so, I do not wish to take any length of time, but shall confine myself to one or two aspects of the resolution that has been moved. Left to myself I would add another clause (c), to include the incidence of tax under the Motor Vehicles Act itself; but now that has been under the present resolution ruled out. So I would only confine myself to the two aspects that have been specified in the resolution. The incidence of tax under the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act has been, to say the least, very heavy ever since the Act came into effect. At the time the legislation was being considered it was expected that this would not be a heavy burden on the owners of motor vehicles. It was the view of the then Secretary for Local Self-Government that this would be a great relief to at least one section of motor owners—namely the owners of private cars. Even the private owners to-day are groaning under the incidence of this new tax. The result, if a searching enquiry were made, would be very obvious, I hope, to the Minister, who has assured us this morning, that he will place before the House information that he is going to get from the various authorities and officers concerned with regard to the licence fee and the other particulars of this motor vehicles taxation. That I think will be done in due course. But before that, with a view to concentrate the attention of the Minister on the aspects on which we want an enquiry should be instituted, this resolution has been moved. It cannot be denied that hundreds of motor vehicles have been withdrawn from the road. The one reason is that the tax levied under the new Act has been heavy and unbearable. The poor owners of motor lorries and motor buses cannot bear the burden of paying this heavy tax, and that, in spite of the fact that the tax may be paid in four instalments. Formerly, before the tolls were abolished, the motor bus owner or the lorry owner used to pay one or two rupees at the toll gates from day to day out of his earnings and he did not feel any great difficulty then. He did not feel that the tolls were so exacting before as the tax under this Motor Vehicles Taxation Act. The idea then was,—I think many of my hon. Friends in the European group will concur with me—that a great impetus would be given by the passing of this Act to the speedy spread of mechanical

1 p.m

[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

[2nd November 1931]

transport throughout the length and breadth of the Presidency. But a short experience has shown that instead of there being further development in mechanical transport, there has been a great check. And if the taxation is to remain as it is to-day, I do not know what will happen to this public utility service and then it will be too late for anyone to rectify things, as they are going on at present.

“ Sir, it has become necessary on account of the experience within these two quarters of the working of this Act, that an early enquiry should be instituted as to where exactly the defect lies. The hon. Minister did not quite admit this morning that there was any defect in the provisions of the Act or the rules of the Act, although he promised that he would examine the question. But surely there must be some reason for the difficulty that has been felt by the owners of buses and lorries.

“ The other point that is raised in this resolution is the enormous licence fee that is levied by the district boards on these motor lorries and buses. The motor bus traffic has been very nearly killed on account of the exorbitant licence fee that has been levied by the district boards, ranging up to Rs. 3,000 in certain districts and not less than Rs. 500 in certain other districts. If you would consider the section of the Local Boards Act which enables the local boards to levy a licence fee, you will see that it does not contemplate the levy of any high fee as is done at present. And so, it is contended in some quarters that the licence fee is not to be a tax and that a tax of such an exacting nature. Licence fee as such, it has been ruled by a decision of the High Court, should be only such as to cover the necessary expense of exercising control over the trade. But under the Local Boards Act it looks as though this has been made a definite source of income to the local authorities. That, Sir, is very reprehensible. Whatever may be the scheme of the Act, it seems to require certain amendments in this direction and, this morning two Bills have been introduced to remedy that state of affairs. But so far as that is concerned, the Government ought to come to the relief of the motor bus owners and lorry owners and even the private car owners if you please. The licence fee has very nearly ruined many of those poor people who have been carrying on trade in conveyance by motor buses and consequently the inconvenience created to the passengers is incalculable. Many of the motor buses have been withdrawn from the road and the overcrowding in buses is very great and people have to wait for hours at bus stands for a seat in one of these buses. Now, Sir, instead of adding further to the conveniences of the public, who largely use these conveyances, the working of the new Act and of the section of the Local Boards Act is a great check on the facilities and convenience already enjoyed by the public. I therefore hope, Sir, that the Minister will agree to appoint a committee to study how exactly the Local Boards Act is working so far as the levy of licence fee is concerned and how the new Motor Vehicles Taxation Act is working so far as the incidence of tax is concerned. I do not think there will be any two opinions

2nd November 1931] [Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

about the unsatisfactory working of these Acts. It is hoped that the resolution will be accepted and the Committee will be instructed, as provided in the resolution, to submit its report before 1st February 1932. I do not think the Minister will stand on any convention and say, 'I am doing it, so let us wait' or say, 'the officers have been asked to do this, so let us wait'. I have no doubt that the appointment of a Committee will strengthen the hands of the Minister and also of those people to whom he has delegated the function of working the Acts. The Committee is intended to help in finding out remedies to allay the great discontent that is prevailing amongst the public, particularly amongst those who are engaged in plying motor buses and lorries. I therefore have great pleasure in seconding this resolution."

* Mr. YAKUB HASAN:—"Mr. President, Sir, when we were passing this Bill in the month of March I made a remark that I did not see any reason for congratulating the Chief Minister in having piloted this Bill and having had it passed in this Council. I stressed that on the other hand I anticipated that this Act would prove very much injurious to the motor transport; and I find that within only seven months the injury that I had anticipated has actually taken place, and as was pointed out by other friends, many motor buses have been driven off the road on account of this heavy burden that they were called upon to bear. The Chief Minister said this morning that this Act itself is not so much responsible for it, but there are other causes, such as trade depression, which have operated also in bringing about this result. Sir, I am convinced that though trade depression must have played some part in this matter, still this Act itself is responsible to a large extent for this bad result. In my speech on the Bill, I had also referred to licence fees that are paid to the district boards which ranged from Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 2,800 a year, and the Bill did not make any change in that respect, nor were the district boards called upon to make any changes. Now, I find that what I had anticipated has come to pass, and this resolution lays down that an enquiry should be made in respect of the licence fees paid to the district boards. This Committee is very necessary and I hope the Chief Minister will not put any obstacle in the way of its being formed. For one thing, it will go into the question thoroughly and show, if any relief is necessary, in what way it can be given. Let it not be thought that because a notice of this resolution has been given by an European gentleman this matter has only to be dealt with from the point of view of the motor trade. I am not at all concerned with the people engaged in the motor trade who suffer on account of the sales of motor cars having been reduced. But what I am concerned with is that transport facilities have been interfered with.

"By doing away with the toll-gates we have provided some convenience to those travelling members of the public who use private motors in going about largely. But on the other hand we have seen that the revenue that was expected by this taxation has been considerably reduced. The reduction of the revenue is mainly due to the reduction in the number of motor cars, motor buses specially. So, I would

[Mr. Yakub Hasan] [2nd November 1931]

beg of the hon. the Chief Minister to let this resolution be accepted and a committee be appointed which will go thoroughly into this question and make recommendations to this Council."

* Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI.—“ Mr. President, Sir, when the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act was passed, all the people dealing in motors and also the local bodies were under the impression that their affairs would go on well. Experience, however, has shown that it has not only injuriously affected those people who are dealing in motors, but also local boards, Sir, there are no standard rates prevailing in the district boards regarding the taxing of motor vehicles. This hits hard people who keep motor lorries and buses and hire out in the Nilgiris. People in the Nilgiris who have to go to Coimbatore for purposes of trade very often suffer greatly on account of this new taxation. They are obliged to pay tax not only to the Nilgiris District Board but also to the Coimbatore District Board. Again, Sir, great hardship is caused to people who hire out motor cars. This morning, in answer to a question the hon. the Chief Minister said that though the Government were not able to pay the anticipated amount to the local boards, he was doubtful whether they were hard hit. I know, Sir, that most of the district boards and municipalities have to recast their budgets, because they are not getting their due share from this source of income. For instance, in the Ootacamund Municipal Council, though the Registrar-General of Local Boards promised to give Rs. 3,000 after some consultation, he fixed only Rs. 2,000. This is much less than their due share. I fear that this would reflect on the condition of the roads in the municipalities. So, I would request the hon. Minister to very carefully consider this resolution for the appointment of a committee thoroughly to investigate the question and accept it.”

Mr. F. G. LUKER.—“ Mr. President, Sir, I need not speak at any length on this resolution because it seems to me that it would be obviously impossible for any hon. Member of this House to oppose the appointment of the committee contemplated by it. I believe, Sir, the difficulties to be faced are many. They are not entirely difficulties of the motor trade which has been referred to. They are not entirely the difficulties of motor transport owners or of users. The difficulties concern the people who ride in buses and who use trucks. The difficulties also concern the district boards. Therefore Sir, it seems to me, the appointment of such a committee is one of extreme urgency. The matter has to be thoroughly examined in the light of the Bill which was passed some months ago. I am glad, Sir, that the scope of the suggested committee is fairly wide and that the problem can be considered from all points of view.

“ I believe, Sir, the facts of the case, as far as the transport owners are concerned, are well known and it is not necessary at this stage to go into them at any length. I will therefore refrain from discussing the question that has been raised of licence fees. In conclusion I say that the matter is one of urgency not only for the trade but also for the district boards.”

2nd November 1931]

* **Mr. A. B. SHETTY**:—"Mr. President, Sir, when this Bill was introduced in the Council, Member after Member welcomed it (A voice: No). Many Members, at any rate, welcomed it as a very necessary measure which will help them in getting rid of the nuisance of toll-gates. And when the Bill was actually passed in the Council, several Members got up in their seats and congratulated the hon. Minister as well as his Secretary on having got through the Council such a piece of legislation. I ventured to differ, Sir, and said, 'the time has not come for us to congratulate the hon. Minister on this piece of legislation. We shall wait and see what the consequences are going to be. Let the hon. Minister take stock of the situation at the end of the year and find out what the effect of the Bill has been on motor transport and trade.' We find, Sir, to-day that people have come to realize that the fears entertained by some of us have come true to a large extent. The Government have not been able to realize the revenue they anticipated from this source. They have not been able to give back to the local bodies the income which they were getting from the toll-gate collections. And, be it noted this was a growing source of income to the district boards all over the Presidency. A great many motor buses, taxis and lorries have already been withdrawn from the road. I understand that, in my own district of South Kanara, about 30 per cent of the buses and taxis have gone off the road and that about 35 'G' permits have been recently suspended. People who have taken to motor transport business, the bus and taxi owners, are being ruined. I am told that the C.P.C. Company—the biggest bus company that we have, not only in South Kanara, but in the whole of Southern India—is losing about Rs. 2,500 every month and that two other bus companies in South Kanara are incurring a loss of Rs. 1,500 to Rs. 2,000 every month. Many of the bus service companies will very soon have to wind up their business and people will be deprived of the convenience afforded by the motor transport. Not only that, the trade and development of the country will also suffer a great deal. We must have, Sir, one consolidated tax and not a number of different taxes on these motor vehicles. We must standardize the licence fees which are now levied at various rates according to various systems. Some district boards charge at so much per mile while others charge at so much per seat. All these must be carefully considered before it is too late. I trust that the hon. Minister will see his way to accept this resolution for the appointment of a committee to consider this matter."

* **Mr. F. E. JAMES**:—"Sir, I wanted to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the actual terms of the resolution. The resolution requests the Government to appoint a committee to study the whole question of motor vehicles taxation in this Presidency with particular reference to the incidence of taxation under the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act. A word or two about that will explain why it has been made one of the terms of reference. In the first place it is suggested that some of the figures in regard to heavy lorries are far too high. In the second place, under the Act as it stands at present, the tax is leviable on all cars, lorries, buses, whether or not they use public roads. I will give instances to emphasize this point. Take the case,

[Mr. F. E. James] [2nd November 1931]

for example, of a large mill like the Buckingham and Carnatic Mills in the city or the Coimbatore Mills which employ lorries to take goods from one part of the mill to another inside the mill area. These lorries do not venture to travel on public roads. And yet, under the Act as it stands at present, they are subject to exactly the same incidence of tax as lorries which are using public roads. Another example, and a case in which I am particularly interested, is the case of lorries in the estates. Lorries are used in estates where there are no public roads. The only time they use public roads is when they are taken straight to the estate from the dealer. Thereafter they live on the estate, move about only on estate roads and do not use public roads. (Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti: State roads?) Estate roads. These lorries are asked to pay exactly the same amount as lorries which use public roads. This is a question which needs examination.

“Then take the case of the private car owner under the Act. Supposing the owner of a private car goes away to England, say, for a Round Table Conference, and leaves his car for six months or probably two years—Round Table Conference might probably last as long!—during the whole of that period, though the car does not use public roads, he has to pay exactly the same amount of tax that is paid by the person who is always using the road unless of course he has taken the trouble to damage his car beforehand and hand it over to a repairer where it can stay all the time by paying repairing charges if necessary. These things I venture to say were not carefully considered at the time of the passing of the Act.

“There are other matters in connexion with the administration of the Act which I have not touched upon. The Government are at present complaining that they are only getting about 50 per cent of the revenue. I venture to suggest that one reason is this: In the method of collection of the tax great difficulty is occasioned. I have complaints from persons, both Indian and European, living in different parts of the mufassal, pointing out the extreme difficulty of paying their licence fees. They are driven from pillar to post, and in some cases it takes three or four hours to complete the transaction. It seems as though Government is reluctant to collect the tax—a most unusual state of mind for any Government! If the regulation for collection were altered in the direction of making it easier to obtain licences, I am sure Government will obtain a far larger revenue.

“The other part of the resolution deals with the licence fees levied by local boards and district municipalities. I want to say here very definitely that those of us who are concerned with this question are not in the least desirous either of putting any blame on the local boards or of injuring their ordinary revenues. What we say is this: when the present Act was passed, this question was not taken fully into consideration. In the second place, when this Act was passed, we did not foresee the tremendous economic slump that was coming. In the third place, we could not foresee the enhanced import duties upon motor vehicles and all accessories which came into being as a result of Government of India's Supplementary Budget. Therefore what we

2nd November 1931]

[Mr. F. E. James]

say now is, that both the motor buses and lorries are subject to taxation by the Provincial Government and the Central Government and the licence fees levied by district or the local boards. They cannot bear this. It is a matter for consideration as to whether the Bills which have to-day been introduced into the House restricting the levy of licence fees should be passed. On an examination of the figures which we have collected this House will find that it puts it beyond all shadow of doubt that as far as the buses and lorries are concerned, the position in many districts is very deplorable and it is quite impossible for many owners of buses and lorries to carry on their business under existing conditions. Therefore we suggest that this is a matter which needs the urgent consideration of this House. Of course we cannot consider it without collecting figures. But since we have collected the necessary figures, we suggest to the Government that they should appoint a Committee as requested by us in the resolution. No Member of the House has a right to oppose this resolution because 'we are all in the same boat.' The district board is losing its revenue; the Government are losing their revenues; the individual owners of cars and buses are penalized; and the public are losing those facilities of transport to which they are recently accustomed, and to which they have a right. When I mention that more than 700 buses have been withdrawn from public circulation in seventeen districts—we have not got figures for other districts—surely it points to the fact that the public are suffering individually because of the withdrawal of the means of transport.

"There is one more thing that I wish to touch upon before I resume my seat. I can quite understand the feelings of those who say. 'You are simply appointing another Committee and there are large number of Members who will have to be appointed as Members of that Committee and that means more expenditure on this account.' I may say at once that we do not specify any Member of this House should be on that Committee. I may say that this resolution is a conservative resolution, because it gives sole power to the Government to appoint the Committee. They need not appoint anyone from this House. We hope that they will appoint only those who possess knowledge from the public point of view, or from the Government point of view, or from the trade point of view. I venture to suggest that the smaller the Committee, the better. I may also suggest to the hon. Minister that 1st February is not too short a date by which the Committee should submit its report. The reason for allowing such a period of time is that they must have some time to make any necessary adjustment between the Government and the district boards with regard to their finances, and that this should take place before the budget next year. If you leave it till the end of the next March, then you will be tempted to postpone it till 1933. It is only fair that the district boards and the Government should know where they are. I therefore do hope that the hon. Minister will accept this resolution as it stands. It commits him to nothing; it commits the House to nothing. Owing to nobody's fault—we cannot blame any single person, either the Minister

[Mr. F. E. James] [2nd November 1931]

or anybody else—this situation has arisen in regard to one of the most important industries in this Presidency. That ought to be remedied as soon as possible. This resolution suggests the effective means of remedying such a situation, and I hope the House will accept it.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“Further discussion on this resolution will be resumed after lunch.”

IV.—THE TIRUMALAI-TIRUPATI DEVASTHANAMS BILL—APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“I nominate Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar as the Chairman of the Select Committee regarding the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill.”

The House then adjourned for lunch.

After Lunch (2-30 p.m.)

III.—RESOLUTIONS ON MATTERS OF GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST—cont.

(2) COMMITTEE TO ENQUIRE INTO MOTOR VEHICLES TAXATION—cont.

Mr. M. A. MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR:—“I beg to move—

‘that in clause (b) for the words “before February the 1st 1932” the words “before the end of the financial year 1931-32, if possible” be substituted.’

“Sir, my object in moving the amendment is this. I do not want to fetter the hands of the Committee or the Government and ask them to submit their report before 1st February 1932. It may not be possible for them to finish their work before that time which is very short. The object of the Mover of the resolution is that adjustments should be made only in the next financial year. I think it is quite sufficient if we have the report before the end of this financial year. By chance even that may not be possible and that is why I have added the words, ‘if possible’ at the end of my amendment. Anyhow I hope that the Committee to be appointed will be able to deliver their report before the end of this financial year.”

Mr. D. V. NARASIMHASWAMI:—“I second it.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“The resolution as well as the amendment are for the consideration of the House.”

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—“Sir, I move that the words ‘if possible’ be omitted from the amendment of my Friend, Mr. Muthiah Chettiyar. Is it the object of the Mover of the amendment to shelve this question? If he was really serious about it, he would have tried to see that the report was made ready before the end of the financial year, so that we may consider the question and make suitable arrangements for the next. The House will remember that when the Bill was under consideration some of us were hypnotized into the belief that it would usher in a millennium and that the moment it was passed and tolls were abolished motorists could easily move from one end of the Presidency to another without any let or hindrance.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“I take it that the hon. Member is speaking on the main resolution also.”

2nd November 1931]

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Yes, Sir. Some hon. Members did not see eye to eye with the hon. Minister and his talented Secretary, Mr. Brown, when they did their best to see this Bill through in the shortest time possible and achieve an object which appeared to them to be a noble one. Also, hon. Members from the mufassal did not realize how the Bill would work in practice. But now that the Bill has been in operation for six or seven months it is clear to everybody what great inconvenience and hardship it has caused not only to the owners of motor vehicles but also to their users. Of course we see that the Bill has realized the other object, namely, that of helping the agriculturists to some extent; but even in their case, many of the agriculturists who have to use motor buses and lorries have been put to much inconvenience as a large number of buses and lorries have gone off the road, being unable to pay the heavy taxes. I hope, now that the working of the Act has proved its defects, hon. Members who voted against us last time will vote with us now and have a Committee appointed to go into the whole question. In this connection let me say that it is not the object of the Mover or any one of us here to put a tax on agriculturists. We cannot say what the Committee will find. But it is clear that the incidence of taxation on motor vehicles is very high and the Bill has failed to achieve the objects which it intended to achieve.

"It may be said that some of my hon. Friends who are interested in the motor trade are responsible for this motion. But it is not they alone who are interested in the matter. We have to consider the fate of many poor people who have lost a lot of money in maintaining motor buses for the service of the public. As Mr. James pointed out, over 700 buses and lorries have gone off the road as they were unable to pay this heavy taxation. There is also the point that as a result of the working of the Act during the first two quarters of the financial year they have not been able to realize even 50 per cent of their anticipated revenue, notwithstanding the extraordinary pains that the officers concerned have taken to see that all the owners of vehicles paid the tax. The low realization is due to the heaviness of the tax. I hope the Government will not put forward the excuse of financial stringency and refuse to accept the resolution. Whatever sum is spent on the Committee to be appointed will be well spent, as they will be able to show the Government ways and means for realizing more revenue under this head. Therefore I have great pleasure in moving my amendment to Mr. Muthiah Chettiay's amendment."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Sir, I have great pleasure in seconding the motion. Sir, the Government must have by this time realized the awkward situation in which they have placed themselves, the district boards, the owners of vehicles and everyone concerned with this matter. But let me say this in fairness to the hon. Minister that he really is not the author of this Bill; he took it up half-heartedly and had to pilot it in the Council as the representative of Government. He had, against his will, to ride a coach and four against all opposition, however reasonable it appeared to him to be. It would have

[Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti]. [2nd November 1931]

been much better and much of this difficulty would have been avoided if my hon. Friends, the representatives of the Trades Association, the Chambers of Commerce and the European Members had co-operated with us in opposing the Bill then. All these difficulties now pointed out by Messrs. James and Birley were pointed out by us both in the Select Committee and afterwards when the Bill was considered in the Council.

2-45
P.m

"I may remind the hon. Minister of his promise to the Council that he would persuade the local bodies to regulate their levy of licence fees in such manner as not to restrict the bus traffic that is going on. Evidently he did not take any steps in that direction. When that statement was made by the hon. Minister, we suggested to him that the present Act might be postponed till he was able to persuade the presidents of local bodies to agree to levy licence fees on some recognized and permanent basis. Evidently he has not been able to do so; nor can I conceive of a time when he would be able to do so. As this is a matter affecting the resources of the local bodies, I am sure that the presidents of these bodies will raise a hue and cry if any encroachment is made upon their revenues. I can conceive of no other way than that of repealing the Act and of restoring the old state of affairs. But when the old state of affairs is restored, it might be considered that the levy of tolls on motor vehicles is a continuous nuisance. If only some workable arrangement could be entered into with local bodies, it is possible that they would be satisfied with a slight increase in the taxation of motor vehicles. But I do not know whether they would be prepared to levy these rates upon carts and incur the displeasure of their immediate electors. Naturally, they would turn their attention towards motor vehicles, because they think that the owner of a motor car or a bus ought to be in a position to pay any amount of taxes. It is quite clear from the figures that have been collected by my hon. Friend, Mr. Luker, that not only private vehicles but also lorries and buses cannot bear this taxation. It would be a piece of great achievement if the Committee that is proposed to be appointed, would be able to suggest some method by which we could reduce the incidence of taxation on motor vehicles, without repealing the Act. I personally do not think that it can be done. But the Government should have no objection to accept this resolution because it helps them to get out of the awkward position in which they have placed themselves. They might as well throw the blame on the Committee if it is not in a position to suggest any course of action for the hon. Minister. People would be satisfied if a study of this question in all its lights is made and if any remedies are suggested to reduce the incidence of heavy taxation on motor vehicles. With these observations I have great pleasure to associate myself with the amendment moved by my hon. Friend."

Mr. M. A. MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR:—"I accept the amendment."

* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"Sir, the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act has not been in force for more than half a year. Now proposals are made to appoint a Committee to examine the working

2nd November 1931] [Sriman M. G. Patnaik]

of the Act. I think that hardly any time has elapsed to see how it has worked. Therefore it is too soon to appoint a Committee for this purpose. There are many steps that have not yet been taken. From what my hon. Friend, Mr. James, and others said, I see that rules had not been framed under section 11 of the Act. If that had been done, there would have been, I think, no complaints on their part. Mr. James said that certain motor vehicles which work within an estate and never use public roads are taxed, because, under the Act, keeping the motor vehicle is taxable. The hon. Minister promised that he would frame rules exempting such vehicles under section 11 but unfortunately, no such rules have been framed. Without appointing any Committee, we can see what the grievances of the people are, and we can trust the hon. Minister to issue these rules at once so that all these grievances might easily be redressed. That is one point.

“The second point is this; the real crux of the question seems to be that there has been a fall in the income of not only all the local bodies, but also traders and manufacturers.

“The local bodies have to spend much larger sums on roads used by the motor vehicles. Before these heavy motor vehicles were on the road, so much money as is spent now, was not spent at all. I know that several wooden culverts have now to be converted, by local bodies, into stronger bridges; thus they have to spend larger sums than they were doing before. No local body would be affected if the number of vehicles using the roads is reduced. Therefore there ought to be no complaint at all from the local bodies. They were forced to agree to arrangements made under the Act. That Act was intended to see that the income of the boards from the tolls did not increase. That Act was passed, I think, at the instance of the European Members. They wanted to see that the total income of local boards did not rise. Before the Act was passed, the district boards were in a position to have any number of toll-gates they pleased. To the great discomfiture of my European friends, they see that their object failed and that their income has gone down. They see that their profits have decreased; that cannot be helped. Fortunately when this Act was passed, we exempted the agriculturists from this tax. I do not know whether this exemption will continue, because the Government may, at any time, instruct the panchayats and local boards to levy some tax on carts used by agriculturists; we cannot trust Government. My European friends come forward now with great anxiety and solicitude for the local boards. I think the boards will belittle this attempt, because, as I have pointed out, they will not be affected at all.

“There is also another point. The local boards would be opposed to this resolution because their right and discretion are going to be curtailed; they have the right to impose as much licence fee as they like, subject to such control as is prescribed in the Local Boards Act. Why should their discretion be fettered by any legislation and for whose sake is it sought to be done? The number of buses that are using the roads is going down; the local bodies know that their income would be reduced. Why should the Legislature or the Government dictate

[Sriman M. G. Patnaik] [2nd November 1931]

to them about the reduction of the licence fee? They are the people of the locality and they are the representatives of the people; they have the sense and the wisdom to know for themselves whether the licence fee should be as high as it is now or whether it should be reduced. We have got different rates for different localities, because people use their discretion taking into consideration the circumstances of the locality. In these circumstances I do not think that the Legislature would be justified in fettering the discretion of the local bodies in this matter. I hope that every Member who represents local bodies will come forward and oppose this resolution.

“Another ground that was urged for this resolution is that the licence fee should be a nominal fee. The fee may be nominal if there be no work to be carried out. As we all know, much damage is caused to the roads by the heavy traffic. There is no reason why the local bodies should not take this fact into consideration in fixing the licence fee. The local bodies should be compensated. If the number of vehicles using the roads goes down, the boards may reduce the licence fee. If they hope to get larger income by reducing the fee, they will do so.

“Great solicitude is felt for the people. My hon. Friend, Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed, said that people have to wait for a long time for motor buses, because the number of the buses is reduced. We must be glad of it, because poor people cannot afford to pay the fares. If there are very many buses, people will be tempted to get into them. Why should a coolie earning about 4 annas a day, get into a bus for short distances, when time is not very much valuable to him? By travelling in buses, they part with a portion of their poor income. The fare should always be a little higher, so that poor people might avoid the temptation of getting into buses. If a large number of people take to providing bus service, there would be competition by which the bus-owners themselves would be injuriously affected. Some hon. Members say that, at present, a large number of bus-owners suffer on account of the high tax. I think that, even if the licence fee is reduced, they will suffer on account of unhealthy competition. They reduce the fares so low as to tempt people to get into buses. I know that in Ganjam, people are taken from Berhampur to Russelkonda a distance of 50 miles, for 4 annas, because there are a large number of buses. The licence fee they pay, is Rs. 1,600. On account of their own fault of unhealthy competition, they ruin themselves. If a limited number of buses ply, they will not suffer. I therefore think that the cheapening of the licence or the reduction of the tax would not really benefit bus-owners. You must honestly induce poor people
 3 p.m. not to travel in buses for short distances; otherwise, this evil is not worse than toddy-drinking itself.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“The hon. Member has reached his time-limit.”

* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—“There are several people here, I believe, who advocate the use of khaddar. Why should they do so?—Because, they say, in view of the economic condition of the

2nd November 1931] [Sriman M. G. Patnaik]

people, they advocate the use of khaddar. Well, Sir, what do we find here? If you take into consideration the present economic condition of the people, should you encourage the use of buses? I think nearly 95 per cent of the money collected by way of fares goes to foreign countries from India. Suppose a man raises Rs. 100 by way of fares, nearly Rs. 95 goes to foreign countries. If that is so, is that to be encouraged? I think it should not be encouraged. Therefore, those who advocate the use of khaddar should, on principle, not plead for the use of these buses. (An hon. Member: 'Is it logical?') If you can think logically and speak logically, you must not spread the use of these motor buses. So, I think the resolution should be opposed."

* Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—"Mr. President, Sir, reference has been made to the chorus of welcome with which this Act was placed on the Statute Book. I am afraid that, at that time, the full effect of the Act was not realized. The Bill was then in the nature of a sugar-coated pill. When the sugar wore away, it was realized that the effect of the Bill was not so salutary as was expected. The sugar was the abolition of the toll-gates and the abolition of the toll-gates was welcomed by every one. It was not realized that the loss of income which followed from the abolition of toll-gates could not be easily made good. I am not, I believe, committing an offence against party loyalty by speaking in favour of the appointment of a Committee. As has been already said, this Bill was not the child of the present Government. It was a legacy and unfortunately, as in similar cases, the value of the legacy was not realized. Perhaps the Government thought the legacy was a very valuable one, and that it was desirable to make full use of that legacy at once. I happened to say, Sir, on the floor of the House at the time, that there was indecent haste in ushering the Bill through; but I found that I was in a very small minority. There was a chorus of welcome, and the only wise people were the Members for the City of Madras like my friend Mr. Basheer Ahmed and Mr. Hameed Khan, and we, Members from the South Kanara district. We said then that the Bill was a very undesirable one; that in any case it should be sufficiently considered before it was passed into law. However, our voices were cries in the wilderness and the Bill has been passed into an Act. But now, instead of there being a chorus of praise all over the country, there is a chorus of disapproval. I do not think it is necessary for me to reiterate all the arguments in favour of the appointment of a Committee. I think the best argument in favour of the appointment of a Committee consists in the facts placed before this House. This Act has not found favour with anybody, the Government, local bodies or the public. The sooner remedies are adopted for getting over the abnoxious provisions of the Act, the better for the country (hear, hear). I think the ordinary principles of taxation were not considered when the Act was passed into law. One of the principles of taxation is that the cost of collection should not be disproportionately heavy. But the cost of collecting this tax is very heavy. A very huge machinery has to be brought into existence to collect this tax. Now, what has the result been? Because such a huge machinery does not exist now, the tax has

[Mr. M. S. Sreshta] [2nd November 1931]

not been fully collected, and it is not possible to collect the tax fully without spending a good deal more than is at present done on super^ovision and similar matters. I think we ought to devise some sort of tax to make good the income which has been lost. Another principle of taxation is that we should give the minimum of annoyance to the tax-payer; but the amount of annoyance that this tax has caused to the tax-payer is enormous. One main cause for the non-collection of taxes is the amount of annoyance caused to tax-payer. I think, therefore, the case has been sufficiently and strongly put before the House to justify the immediate appointment of a Committee. That Committee should consider fully all the aspects of the case, and within the scope of the Committee's powers should be the suggestion of some remedial measures and the suggestion of some other form of taxation to make good the loss which would be incurred if this present Act is not to be continued. At the time the Act was passed, as I said, its full effect was not realised. I am afraid even the bus-owners did not realise, nor did the traders in motor vehicles and accessories, that this would be a great blow to the bus industry and motor trade. I do not propose to speak about the primitive arguments of the gentleman who just spoke before me. I do not think those primitive arguments will appeal to anybody here; I think we know the old fable of killing the goose that laid the golden eggs. This Act, in my opinion, has done a lot of harm to the people, and at this time of depression, at this time when all trades are undergoing great suffering, it is necessary that early steps should be taken to correct the mistake that has been made."

Mr. F. BIRLEY:—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to state that I accept the amendment proposed by Mr. Muthiah Chettiyar."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"Sir, I did expect, on this resolution, a certain amount of criticism of the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act; because I know that even before the Act has been in force for six months, circumstances arose which were bound to confuse the main issue. The feeling then that tolls should go was one that was shared by a very large section, and if after I moved the Bill last year, I was encouraged to proceed with it and to give effect to it this year, it was, Sir, because of the feeling that actuated a large section of the House and also of the Members of the Select Committee that the Act ought to be given effect to on the 1st April 1931. But unfortunately, after the Act came into force, circumstances intervened which have created the present situation.

"One point, however, that I want to bring to the notice of the hon. Members of this Council and of those who spoke about the undesirability or otherwise of this Act is that they have forgotten what effect the present economic distress has had on the bus-trade itself. Sir, I can claim to have some experience and some knowledge of the working of this trade itself; as president of a district board, I have had occasions to deal with the question of giving licences to a number of buses. During a period of nearly seven years, I have watched how the number of buses slowly rose and I have also watched how the licence

2nd November 1931] [Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

fees also slowly rose year after year. What was the result? In normal years when money was available and people could command credit, the actual number of buses on the roads slowly rose. I may also inform the House that at one stage when a reference was made by a district board to restrict the number of motor buses running on the roads, objection was taken that they should not restrict the number and it was also said that the law did not permit such restriction. The result was that a number of buses had been put on the road, even though the district boards did not like it and there has been so much of competition between them that while they paid large licence fees, they also underbid between themselves and charged very low rates. This year, when they could not keep their credit, the result has been perceptible in two ways. While every year some buses would be condemned and go off the road, there would always be new buses coming in to the road by new purchases made. Unfortunately, this year—I am sure the committee which will go into this matter will certainly find it—the coming in of buses had ceased while the going out of the buses is there; and more buses have gone this year, because the people could not find the necessary credit to meet their charges and liabilities. Therefore, Sir, I say it is too early now to say really whether the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act has led to this effect—as some say—or whether it is only one of the contributory causes and whether therefore when normal conditions return, the Act would not still receive the approbation which it had once received. I may say, Sir, that whatever the opinion of the House may be at the present time, when they really go into the facts, they will be able to find that this Act is not solely responsible for the present situation.

“ Apart from that, Sir, there is another point that is urged; that the licence fees levied by the district boards were heavy, that the general complaint was that they were excessive in certain cases and that the fees should be reduced or standardized as one hon. Member put it. That was of course a specific case put forward when the Bill was on the anvil, and I made it clear then that that could not be tackled immediately but that it should be left to adjust for itself. I expect, Sir, the district boards to be businessmen as every businessman is. The Act has been enforced; within six months they have had their own experience and they should be able to decide for themselves to what extent their licence fees need be reduced. I may inform the House that the amount of licensing fees which the district boards got last year was about Rs. 22 lakhs—not a small sum—and if really as we put it here, the district boards are suffering as a result of driving all these motor buses off the road, the natural effect will be for the district boards themselves to reconsider the position and see to what extent they can reduce their own licence fees—to see that they did not kill the hen that laid the golden eggs. Sir, I do not object to a Committee going into the question and doing the work on their behalf; but I am anxious to make it quite clear that whatever may be your anxiety to see that the licence fees are reduced and more motor buses come in, your anxiety should also be to see that the

[Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu] [2nd November 1931]

district boards are in a position to find the money wherewith to discharge their legitimate duty of maintaining the roads in good condition. I must state here, that taking the year 1926-27, taking second-class roads alone—over which most of the buses are running—the expenditure on the second-class roads by all the district boards put together was Rs. 50 lakhs; in 1928-29, it went up to Rs. 54 lakhs and in 1930-31 it had reached Rs. 64 lakhs. It will be seen clearly that the district boards have, while receiving income from bus licences, not stinted to spend that money on the roads and make them what they are to-day. If the effect of any Committee's recommendations should be not to take also the interests of the district boards into consideration, but merely to think of putting in more buses on the road by reducing the licence fees, it will be a disastrous thing; and I am sure district boards can have no other way open to them to make up for the loss of income, but to cut down their present expenditure on road maintenance. On the other hand, if it should be necessary to encourage more buses coming on the road, it will, to that extent, be all the more necessary on the part of the district boards to increase their expenditure on the roads, in order to keep them in a fit condition for such increased number of buses. Therefore, Sir, the mere fact that 700 buses have gone off the road cannot be a ground to say that the Act requires revision. After all, it may be a case where owners of buses put on the roads were managing them in an uneconomical manner. I find, Sir, that roughly about 6,000 buses, according to the census of last year, have been licensed to run for hire, and if 700 have gone off the road, we could not say definitely that it is due to this licence fee or tax. It may be due”

3-15 P.M. Mr. F. E. JAMES:—“ May I point out that this figure of 700 relates only to 17 districts? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—“ May be.

“ It may be due to the fact that a large number of people who had been quite ready to purchase buses on the hire-purchase system not realizing their responsibility and the fact that they have to repay the whole debt, have become unable to pay; and as a result, many buses have gone out of the road, and those who have been doing the business on the most uneconomical lines have found themselves to be losers. But, whatever it may be, in view of the strong feeling in this House, I am prepared to agree to a Committee being appointed to go into this matter. Some of my friends stated that it was the duty of the Government to bring forward a resolution of this sort, but I may say that the Government have always been conscious of this difficulty; they have taken note of the representations made by various bodies, and they have already moved in that direction. It was intended to collect the whole information for the presidency as quickly as possible and examine the whole question thoroughly. But if you think that the appointment of a Committee is a better remedy, I have no objection, because the Government would have an opportunity to examine the pros and cons of the question and also the Committee's report. And I am glad also that

2nd November 1931] [Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

the Mover has accepted the amendment for the submission of the report before the end of the financial year, 1931-32; I take it that this amendment has been put forward so that the necessary financial re-adjustments may be made. I do not know what ultimately are going to be the recommendations of the Committee, but, whoever may be on the Committee and whatever may be their personal interests or otherwise in seeing that a particular trade is promoted, I would appeal to them, just as they said that Government should not kill the goose that lays the golden eggs, that they on their part should not kill the hen that lays the golden eggs. Because I say you cannot afford to restrict the activities of the district boards and cripple their finances with which alone they can manage their affairs in a satisfactory manner. I hope that the Committee will consider not only the aspect that the import of buses should not be restricted, but also the desirability of seeing that the district boards get as much money as possible consistently with the running of the buses in the most economical manner. I have therefore no objection to this Committee being appointed."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT.—"I will now put the second amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

that the words 'if possible' occurring at the end of the first amendment be deleted."

The amendment was carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I will put the first amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

'that in clause (b) of the resolution for the words "before February the 1st 1932", the words "before the end of the financial year, 1931-32" be substituted.'

The amendment was carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I will now put the resolution as amended to the vote of the House.

"The question is that

'This Council recommends to the Government that a Committee be appointed to study the whole question of the taxation of motor vehicles in the Presidency, with special reference to—

(a) the incidence of the tax under the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931;

(b) the licence fees levied by local boards and district municipalities; and

further that the Committee be instructed to submit its report before the end of the financial year, 1931-32.'"

The motion was carried.

[Mr. F. E. James] [2nd November 1931]

or anybody else—this situation has arisen in regard to one of the most important industries in this Presidency. That ought to be remedied as soon as possible. This resolution suggests the effective means of remedying such a situation, and I hope the House will accept it.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“Further discussion on this resolution will be resumed after lunch.”

IV.—THE TIRUMALAI-TIRUPATI DEVASTHANAMS BILL—APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“I nominate Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar as the Chairman of the Select Committee regarding the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill.”

The House then adjourned for lunch.

After Lunch (2-30 p.m.)

III.—RESOLUTIONS ON MATTERS OF GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST—cont.

(2) COMMITTEE TO ENQUIRE INTO MOTOR VEHICLES TAXATION—cont.

Mr. M. A. MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR:—“I beg to move—

‘that in clause (b) for the words “before February the 1st 1932” the words “before the end of the financial year 1931-32, if possible” be substituted.’

“Sir, my object in moving the amendment is this. I do not want to fetter the hands of the Committee or the Government and ask them to submit their report before 1st February 1932. It may not be possible for them to finish their work before that time which is very short. The object of the Mover of the resolution is that adjustments should be made only in the next financial year. I think it is quite sufficient if we have the report before the end of this financial year. By chance even that may not be possible and that is why I have added the words, ‘if possible’ at the end of my amendment. Anyhow I hope that the Committee to be appointed will be able to deliver their report before the end of this financial year.”

Mr. D. V. NARASIMHASWAMI:—“I second it.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“The resolution as well as the amendment are for the consideration of the House.”

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—“Sir, I move that the words ‘if possible’ be omitted from the amendment of my Friend, Mr. Muthiah Chettiyar. Is it the object of the Mover of the amendment to shelve this question? If he was really serious about it, he would have tried to see that the report was made ready before the end of the financial year, so that we may consider the question and make suitable arrangements for the next. The House will remember that when the Bill was under consideration some of us were hypnotized into the belief that it would usher in a millennium and that the moment it was passed and tolls were abolished motorists could easily move from one end of the Presidency to another without any let or hindrance.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“I take it that the hon. Member is speaking on the main resolution also.”

[2nd November 1931]

(3) COLLECTION OF LAND REVENUE IN SIX EQUAL INSTALMENTS

Mr. C. SATYANARAYANA CHOUDARI:—"Sir, under Standing Order 33, I beg to move that the consideration of resolutions Nos. 2 to 7 on the agenda be postponed until resolution No. 8 is disposed of."

Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDAR:—"I second it."

The motion was carried and the consideration of resolutions Nos. 2 to 7 was accordingly postponed.

Resolution No. 8 on the agenda was then taken up.

* Mr. C. SATYANARAYANA CHOUDARI:—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move the resolution which stands in my name and which runs thus:

'This Council recommends to the Government that the collection of land revenue be extended over six instalments of equal amounts.'

"Sir, this resolution has become necessary on account of the continued and serious economic depression among the agriculturists for the last two years. A great catastrophe has come upon the people from finance or from the complicated system of credit and currency which in its relation to credit has become dislocated to an alarming extent. A few financiers sitting in New York, London and Paris pursuing their own ends and looking after their own interests have managed to wreck the economic fabric of the whole world, to destroy the fruits of good harvests and the productive accomplishments of human agency. As a result, Sir, prices fall, insecurity spreads and the world goes down steadily into darkest depression. That the ryots of this province are passing through critical times to-day none can dispute. Even last year, Sir, we felt that the depression was so keen that it had reached its lowest level. We felt, Sir, that it could not go lower still. We expected that thereafter the march was bound to be only upwards. But to-day we find that all our calculations, all our expectations are frustrated, baffled. To-day we find, Sir, that the condition of the ryot is becoming worse day by day. The economic position of the ryot is becoming more and more a matter for anxiety. Even during normal times when Mr. Holdsworth thought that he could take Rs. 6 or Rs. 6-4-0 as the permanent average price of a bag of paddy, I, as one who can testify to the position of agriculturists in the country, can say, Sir, that agriculture was not a paying proposition. Agriculture has not even been a self-supporting profession and, if I may say so, agriculture has been a positively losing concern. Now, Sir, it may be asked, if agriculture has really been not paying, why then should so many thousands of people keep to the land? The answer to the question is not far to seek. Ours is an essentially agricultural country. We have no factories; we have no workshops; we have no political freedom to enable us to acquire livings in other countries and to benefit by trade with other countries. Now, that is the secret of the psychology of the Indian ryot. Now, Sir, as I was saying, the ryot of this province has never been a happy being. He is half-fed; he is ill-clad; he can never afford a decent, full meal; he

2nd November 1931] [Mr. C. Satyanarayana Choudari]

can never afford a full covering for his body. Now, Sir, when that is the position of the agriculturist who pays the revenue to keep the administration going, is it not the duty of the Government to get alarmed at the danger of its manhood, of its very man power perishing. I would therefore appeal to the Government in the interests of its own self-preservation, if not out of altruistic considerations, to rise to the occasion, to come to the rescue of the ryot and to do something to give him relief. The condition of the ryot to-day is something like the condition of the man on his death-bed. It is the duty of the Government to render every possible help to give him relief. There are several ways in which the Government can come to the rescue of the ryot. The method suggested in my resolution is the least that can be expected of any responsible Government. There are other ways in which the Government are bound to come to the rescue of the ryots in a situation like this. In fact, Sir, I have given notice of a resolution recommending to the Government remission of 50 per cent of the land revenue. Now, Sir, the condition of the ryot is so bad that I can very easily make out a case for remission of land revenue by 50 per cent. But unfortunately my resolution did not come up in the ballot. Miss Ballot was unfavourable to me. She preferred the hand of the rich Government and rejected the hand of the poor ryot. Well, Sir, if last year the ryot was able to pay the taxes, it was not because he had money available; it was not because he had ready cash at his disposal. It was with the greatest difficulty that the ryots could pay their taxes last year. I know of cases where the ryots were compelled to lay their hands upon the jewels of their ladies, pledge them or sell them to meet the demand for land revenue. Now, Sir, these jewels are exhausted. That source is closed now, and there is nothing left on the person of the ladies of the family of an average ryot except their *tali*. Now, Sir, if the Government should insist upon the payment of land revenue as in normal conditions, it will mean a great hardship to the ryots. The demand for the payment of cesses is made from the month of January. January and February are months, Sir, when the ryot gathers his produce from the field. It is just the time when the produce comes to his hand, and if the Government insists upon the payment of land revenue in those same months as in normal conditions, the Government will be compelling the ryots to bring their produce all at once to the markets. That is just the season when every ryot gets his produce. And if every ryot is compelled to bring his produce to the market, then the law of supply and demand comes into operation with all its vigour. There is more supply than demand, and therefore the ryots get very low prices for their produce. The result of the Government insisting upon the payment of land revenue as in normal conditions would be to compel the ryot to borrow, for his produce at that time would fetch a very very low price only. The consequence of it would be that after paying Government revenue there will be nothing left for the ryot to enable him to live until the next crop becomes available for him. Now, Sir, I would make an appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member not to judge the wealth of the people by the scale of

[Mr. C. Satyanarayana Choudari] [2nd November 1931]

the receptions that he is accustomed to in his tours, by the scale of the tea parties that he is accustomed to in his tours. I would appeal to him to go into the spirit of the whole matter, and to take this assurance from me that, after all, things are not so prosperous as they are made to appear to him when he goes about touring in the country parts. The way in which the Revenue subordinates get up these functions, get up these shows makes it impossible for even the hon. the Revenue Member, however well intentioned he may be, to know the real condition of the ryot. This is true of even the District Collectors. The District Collectors also are handicapped in the same way. Now, Sir, these tea parties and grand functions are arranged at the cost of the ryot and the result of it is that these tea parties create the false impression upon the Members of the Government that the people are really rolling in wealth. Now, Sir, this is an unfortunate position for the ryot. By these tea parties and grand receptions that are being arranged at his cost, the ryot is actually made to commit suicide in this way. I would respectfully appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member not to go away with the impression that even in the delta areas there is prosperity. In fact, if I am not revealing a secret, last year when I was talking to the hon. the Revenue Member in company with some other Members of this House in connexion with some question, he said that he was surprised that a deputation should wait on him for giving this concession to the ryot of the delta areas.

3-30
p.m.

“He further said that he was under the impression—I do not know, Sir, whether he would remember it, I remember it distinctly—that he was under the impression that it is honey and milk that flowed in the rivers of the deltaic taluks. That he should have carried that impression is an unfortunate thing for the ryot. I could understand how that impression was formed by the hon. the Revenue Member. Our interview with him was about Guntur and Kistna and Godavari districts; I know the grand scale on which he was received and the grand parties that were given to him when he visited those places last year. Probably that was the reason for the impression created on him. I would put my appeal on another basis. It is not safe for the Government to live in the midst of hungry mouths. It is not part of wisdom to allow hungry mouths to grow in large numbers. History tells us what happened when hungry mouths grew in numbers. History tells us that the first thing these hungry mouths do is to devour the Government. Are we not to take lessons from history and guard ourselves against such a danger? This is what is happening in England, in Spain and in Russia. This is what happened in France.

“Now, Sir, I would just mention another matter. We the representatives of the people sitting here have always been anxious and willing to judge the hon. Members on the Treasury Bench on their merits. We have always appreciated their good acts. If the hon. Members sitting on the Treasury Bench expect ungrudging and unstinted support from the representatives of the people sitting here

2nd November 1931] [Mr. C. Satyanarayana Choudari]

in the matter of the administration of the country we have also got a right, Sir, to expect the hon. Members to respond in a sympathetic manner to the appeals that we make on behalf of the people. Constitutionally and temperamentally Indian is an emotional being and his memory is very short. He forgets past wrongs very easily. If any hon. Member sitting on the Treasury Bench thinks that he is unable to command the confidence of the House, is it fair that the entire blame for the responsibility should be laid at the door of the Members of this House? I would just remind the hon. the Revenue Member, Sir, that the charge or the impression that seems to prevail in the Government circles that we are not giving our support to the Government or that we are supporting the Transferred Half to a greater extent than the Reserved Half is not well-founded. I would refer the hon. the Revenue Member to the case of the hon. the Law Member when he was before us in this House with his demands at the budget time last year. Sir, the House felt that the hon. the Law Member was always ready to respond, that he always tried to meet us half-way; and that was the reason why he was able to carry his demands with less difficulty and more ease than the other hon. Members (Laughter). That is an instance which disproves the charge that we have been following a policy of obstructionist tactics. To quote another instance to disprove the charge, Sir, that we are partial to the Transferred Half."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I wish the hon. Member returns to the question of the six instalments."

Mr. C. SATYANARAYANA CHOUDARI:—"Now, Sir, I am coming to the point. I am making an appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member to review what our attitude has been to see how we have been appreciating good acts on the part of the Government so that we may assure him that if he is prepared to accept my resolution and help the ryot, he will not be forgotten at the time when he appears before this House at the time of the next budget comes on."

"Just one word more with regard to the charge that we have been partial to the Transferred Half. Take the case of the Education Minister. When he was before the House with his Excise Demands, everyone of us criticised him. That shows that we, the representatives of the people here, are always anxious to appreciate anything good done by the Government and to give praise where it is due and criticise when hon. Members deserve it. Therefore I would appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member to earn our gratitude and the gratitude of the people by his rising to the occasion and by viewing this resolution in a spirit of sympathy and by doing something to save the ryots from complete annihilation."

* Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"I rise to second this resolution moved by my Friend the hon. Member from Guntur. I do so with a full sense of responsibility of what is proper for the Government to do. I hold that the resolution is an innocuous one from the

[Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar] [2nd November 1931]

point of view of Government also. By accepting the resolution the Government do not lose any portion of the revenue that they are entitled to expect from the land. To some of us—because I know the House is not constituted entirely of elected representatives—to whom it is given to more with the people it seems to be our duty to bring before this House the gravity of the situation, the great economic difficulties under which the peasants of our country and our Presidency in particular are labouring under at present. Suffice it to say that, on account of the precipitous fall in the price of produce, persons who have been hit hardest have been the unfortunate ryots. Even last year the effect of the fall in price of food stuffs has been such as to compel the ryot to have recourse to the pledging of jewels of his family and in most cases of the lands, for purposes of paying the kist. Sir, I could speak with first hand knowledge of these conditions, because I happen to represent in this House a rural constituency and I would urge upon the consideration of the Government the necessity for giving the peasant a chance to live. The only way in which the Government can do this, without any inconvenience, is to receive the kist amount which is due to the Government in easy instalments. I do not propose to refer at any great length to the chronic indebtedness for which the Indian peasant is so notorious. It is a fact which is within the competence of the Government to realize and coupled with that there is the other fact that the Indian peasant has no economic reserve whatsoever and that it is impossible for him to put by any money. Nay, it is even difficult for him to continue to keep his body and soul together from and out of the produce of his land. These facts when taken into consideration along with the other fact that even at present there is no certainty of what the prices are going to be—and a study of the index figures does not disclose which way the prices are moving in the coming two months—I think it is necessary that a resolution of this sort whereby certain concessions are given to the ryot enabling him to pay the kists in six instalments instead of four is absolutely necessary and it is our duty, Sir, to bring this fact home to the notice of the Government so that they can extend at least this concession. In this connection it should be remembered that the incidence of land revenue was originally based on a certain proportion of the actual produce raised on the land; it will be easy if to-day that original basis of land taxation is remembered and, should the Government choose to collect taxation *in kind* and not in money every agriculturist in our Presidency would welcome that mode of payment of the tax. But to revert to that form of taxation may be difficult, and, because the Government has fixed as tax, a certain proportion of the expected profit, without any relation to the actual cost of production prevailing at present, the resolution gains further force. I do not think any further argument is necessary because I am sure most of the hon. Members realize the importance of the resolution and certain other hon. Members may be very anxious to express their opinion on the point. I have therefore great pleasure in seconding the resolution moved by my hon. Friend."

2nd November 1931]

* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"Mr. President, Sir, at the present time in most districts land revenue is collected in four instalments. In some cases it is collected in three and in a very small area in two. Certain definite principles have been laid down to be borne in mind when fixing the kistbandi and one of the important principles is that no instalment should be collected before the ordinary time of harvest of the tract concerned and before the ryots have had a chance of selling their produce. The kistbandi is re-examined on every occasion when the re-settlement of the district takes place by the Settlement Officer who listens to and reports on any representations that may be made to him in that connexion and the Government re-consider the kistbandi then in force. Now, Sir, I am somewhat disappointed in the speech of the hon. Mover as I expected to hear from him some reasons why it is preferable to have six instalments rather than four. He gave a description of the condition of the ryot which seemed to me somewhat exaggerated and as unduly pessimistic. The more instalments we have the more trouble there is in connexion with the collection of the land revenue not only to the Government officers but also to those who have to pay. It means that they are worried six times by the village officers instead of four times in regard to their payment of the land revenue. Further, once the ryot has sold his produce, there is no reason why he should not pay the Government dues and, if the payment is postponed, there is a danger of his spending his money in other ways such as on marriage ceremonies, etc. Well, Sir, these are matters which have to be considered. It was suggested by the Mover of the resolution, I believe, that by collecting the revenue in four kists the prices are necessarily lowered because too much produce is forced on the market. During the last season when the economic depression became evident I ordered that this particular matter should be specially watched. We watched the prices at the principal markets.

"Those prices are determined by world conditions. Now, if the price in the district bears a constant relation to that world price making due allowance for distance from the district to the exporting centres and any other matters that should be allowed for such as merchant's profits, etc., if that price in the district bears a constant relation to the world market price, then obviously we are not forcing upon the market more produce than it can absorb. That is to say, that amount of produce would be sold whether we were demanding the revenue or not. In one case, on the recommendation of the Collector, the kists were postponed in the hope that prices would rise. As a matter of fact, the prices fell. So, far from being beneficial to the ryot, the action taken had the contrary effect, because the ryot was not able to get as much money for his produce which he would have got at the time when the kist was really due. So, Sir, it does not necessarily follow that because we increase the number of kist instalments we should be benefiting the ryot. It is a matter of speculation whether the price will go up or not. On the other hand, there is the disadvantage that the ryot will be worried on more occasions for his revenue.

3-45
p.m.

[Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell] [2nd November 1931]

“ Now, Sir, the Economic Enquiry Committee which the Government appointed in the early part of this year made a recommendation to the following effect:—

‘ In consideration of the fact that generally the harvest time is the time when it is least advantageous for a ryot to sell his crops, although we are aware that to some extent the crops are the security for the payment of kists, and unless the Government collect it then, there is some slight risk that the ryot will sell his crop to pay his other debts and neglect to pay his kists rendering its recovery more difficult, we recommend that the proposal to defer the kist dates until some little time after the harvest should receive the careful consideration of the Government.’

“ As I have already said it is one of our standing principles that the first kist should be demanded only after the usual harvest. But, Sir, on this recommendation of the committee we referred the whole question to the Board of Revenue and have asked it to consider and report whether the kistbandi requires revision in any district or in any portion of a district. It is therefore open to hon. Members of this House or to anyone else to make representations to the Collector of the district or to the Board of Revenue to make an alteration of the kistbandi.”

The resolution was put and carried.

-(4) HALF-FEE CONCESSION TO STUDENTS OF MUSLIM, BACKWARD AND DEPRESSED COMMUNITIES

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—“ Mr. President, I beg the leave of the House to move Resolution No. 2 regarding half-fee concession to Muslim students, etc., which stands in the name of Mr. S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib, on the agenda.”

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—“ I move under Standing Order 33 that the consideration of Resolutions Nos. 2 to 7 be held over and that precedence be given to Resolution No. 9, which deals with the Madras Co-operative Milk Supply Union.”

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—“ I am afraid, Sir, there are far too many requests to change the order of business, so that those gentlemen in whose names the other resolutions are ballotted are put at a severe handicap. As a matter of fact, I expected that my resolution with regard to the constitution of a committee to investigate into jail conditions would be given preference. Having regard to the fact that one hon. Member had already been given a chance to go against the order in the agenda, I do not think it is prudent for me to press my request.”

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—“ Under Standing Order 33, I move that Resolution No. 7 regarding the grant of loans to the ryot population be taken up immediately.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“ I am afraid there have been too many deviations from the agenda. At this rate, I should like to go on with the agenda as it is. I take it that Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan has got the leave of the House to move Resolution No. 2 standing in the name of Mr. Beyabani Sahib.”

The House signified its consent.

2nd November 1931]

• • Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" Mr. President, Sir, I move—

'This Council recommends to the Government that the present Government orders pertaining to half-fee concession may be revised, and pupils and students belonging to Muslim, Oriya and backward and depressed communities, in all schools and colleges, Government, local bodies or aided, shall be given half-fee concession as a rule, that poverty certificate shall be required to be produced only in case of doubt and that the certificate of poverty produced from recognized persons shall in all cases be accepted by the heads of the institutions.'

" Sir, I do not wish to take up much time of the House. But I hope the House is already aware of the hardship that is experienced by the members of the various communities to whom half-fee concession was given previous to the decision of one of the Ministers in charge of Education to take away that concession from each of those communities. What the resolution seeks to do is not a thing which will involve the Government financially very much. Half-fee concession is there in one form or other. Half-fee concession is given to a number of pupils and students who get certificates of poverty from recognized persons. Sir, this poverty certificate is a thing which if properly exercised will be of real benefit in distinguishing between persons who deserve the half-fee concession from those who do not. But as a matter of fact, what happens is when a certificate is needed from a certain pupil or student, it is only such students who have got any influence, or who really are students belonging to an influential section of the community, find it possible to reach a recognized person or authority and get that certificate in order to secure the half-fee concession. It becomes difficult for headmasters and principals of schools and colleges to distinguish between a person that does deserve that concession and one that does not. What happens is that people who really do not deserve the concession get it and people deserving it do not get it. In order to remove that difficulty, this resolution is brought before this House. What is sought to be done by this resolution is to prevent people who really can pay full fees from getting the half-fee concession. It is with that object this clause is inserted in the resolution, 'that poverty certificate shall be required to be produced only in case of doubt.' If the headmaster or principal in charge of the institution doubts the poverty of the pupil who has been paying half-fee and he thinks that the boy can pay full fees, then he can ask that boy to get a certificate to testify to his real poverty. But, on the other hand, what is being done now is to force poor boys who cannot pay full fees to bring a certificate, and it is very difficult for them to bring a certificate and on that account they are unable to continue the studies.

" The other thing which I wish to say in this connexion is that the hon. Minister may of course come forward and say that the Muslim Education Committee is sitting and that that Committee will be considering this question also. But, Sir, I do not know when that Committee will be able to finish its work and when it will submit its report to the Government. In the meantime, this little difficulty that

[Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan] [2nd November 1931]

exists in this matter can be removed by the hon. Minister himself, and I am sure that if that Committee comes to any decision with regard to this particular point, the hon. Minister can consider that also. But, meanwhile, what we would request the hon. Minister to do is to just remove this defect in order to enable the really deserving poor students to prosecute their studies without any hindrance."

* B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur:—" Mr. President, in rising to second this resolution, I am fully aware of the policy of retrenchment that both the Government and the Members of this Council are concerned about at this moment. So far as this resolution as it stands is concerned, I do not think that there is any additional financial charge intended to be imposed upon the Government. Because, what it seeks to do is only to set the whole thing in order, so that the poor students may not be obstructed in the matter of prosecuting their studies. As the hon. Mover has said, what happens really is that when a Muslim boy or a boy of a backward class seeks admission, he is asked to produce a poverty certificate and it is a condition that the certificate must be from certain local officials or presidents of taluk boards or district boards or chairmen of municipalities. We know in these days, it is only the rich and the more influential people that can ever have access to the tahsildar of the locality or the district board or taluk board president and such other personages. What really happens is—I know that such things have happened in many cases—that in the case of the very poor students the tahsildar cannot be expected to know them, nor have the parents any facilities to approach the tahsildar. At times it becomes very difficult to approach the district board or taluk board president, perhaps because in the previous election this poor parent might not have helped the particular president he should approach, or he might have helped his opponent. For this reason, he may be unable to approach the particular president. As a matter of fact, even though the boy is really poor he is very often deprived of the benefit of the half-fee concession for reason of not being able to obtain the necessary poverty certificate from a recognized gentleman. The result is that many parents are very often prevented from educating their boys. I know actual instances in which students have had to stop their education on account of the fact that they were not in a position to produce the poverty certificate which they are required to produce under the rules. It may be in certain cases that on account of the influence wielded by rich and influential gentlemen they are able to get a poverty certificate even though they do not deserve any help. What the resolution seeks to do is to vest the discretion in the heads of institutions who will be quite familiar with the affairs of the locality, and only if the headmaster or principal feels any doubt about the poverty of the boy, he should demand a poverty certificate. The resolution has been put in a very modest form, and I do not see any reason why the hon. Minister should not accept it. I have great pleasure in seconding this resolution."

4 P.M. * Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—" Mr. President, I thought that the resolution would not be taken up; but since some members in whose names

2nd November 1931] [Mr. M. Devadasan]

the resolution stood moved for precedence being given to this motion, I am glad that this has been taken now up for the consideration of the House. The House knows that education is an important thing for the backward communities, and representing, as I do, the depressed classes, I must say that without education the depressed classes cannot attain to any social status, because it is only education that gives them the idea of independence, self-respect and equality. The depressed classes are still backward and still poor. Because these people are very poor, this concession is necessary for them. I must say the depressed classes are much poorer than the Muslims or Oriyas or other backward classes. So I feel it my duty to support this resolution.

“There has been difficulty experienced in the matter of getting poverty certificates. The parent has to approach the village headman or karnam, and it takes a long time for these people to accede to the request of the parent. Moreover, he has to propitiate these demi gods in order to obtain the certificate. If the application goes to the tahsildar, he sleeps over it for months and the result is that the poor student is sent out of the school. So these difficulties stand in the way of the education of the poor boys. It will not be out of place for me to say that in the State of Travancore which is second to none in point of education, a more liberal concession is allowed in favour of the depressed classes. It gives free education up to the school final class to pupils of the depressed classes, whether Hindu or Christian, and they are not required to produce poverty certificates either from the headman or the tahsildar. The moment a pupil says to the headmaster of a school that he belongs to a depressed class, he is allowed free. If that is the state of things in a Native State which is orthodox, I do not see why our Government should not make a similar concession, without asking for poverty certificates. I appeal to the hon. Minister as well as to the other Members of the House to accord their support to this resolution and give effect to it without delay. With these few remarks, I support the resolution.”

* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayō:—“Sir, this resolution has reference to Rule 92 of the Madras Educational Rules, and the classes mentioned in the resolution are found mentioned in that rule also. But there are certain defects which have to be remedied. The first thing is that the rule does not make any provision for any appeal being preferred against the decision of the management of a school. There ought to be some appeal provided. Especially with regard to schools under public management there is some difficulty. The Government grant a lump sum to a municipal school or board school, say, Rs. 3,000. Now the managers of these schools or the local bodies are expected to meet out of this sum the loss of fee income, whereas in regard to private schools under private management, the Government will have to make good the loss of fee income. That is what the rule provides. In regard to the schools under public management, the managers of schools under public management do not view with favour the applications made for half-fee concessions. The affected party becomes the judge and the judge decides the case in his own favour. That is the state of things, and unless the Government remedy that defect, there will be always this difficulty standing in

[Sriman M. G. Patnaik] [2nd November 1931]

the way of these poor pupils of depressed classes and backward communities. The real difficulty lies this way. If you take a certificate to the municipal chairman who is the manager of the high school, he says 'I won't respect it', and no record is maintained in any school as to the applications made and how they were disposed of. The rule says in cases of doubt certificates may be produced. But whose doubt? That is not mentioned. Is it the doubt of the headmaster of the school or the manager of the school? If it is the doubt of the headmaster of the school, I think he will view the matter more generously than the chairman of the municipality, because the latter is naturally concerned with saving more money. There are also other defects to be remedied. I have given a draft amendment to the hon. the Minister as to how the rule may be amended. We need not fear that the Retrenchment Committee will apply its axe to the concession granted under that rule. If my proposal as to the amendment of Rule 92 is accepted, then there will be no difficulty."

* Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAIH—"Sir, thanks to Government, municipalities and local boards that have been extending the grant of half-fee concessions to the depressed classes. But there is difficulty at times in the way of these pupils getting them in time. Taking the case of the students studying in the colleges, as soon as the college year opens, the principals of these colleges insist on the students of the depressed classes to remit the full fees, and it takes not one or two months, but sometimes five to six months before the students come to know that they are allowed half-fee concession. In the case of high schools, recently I was told that students who had not taken 60 per cent in English would not be eligible for the half-fee concession. As a matter of fact, I know that some of the students due to the hardship in paying full fees at the beginning of the term had to discontinue their studies. Though Rule 92 of the Education Manual gives power to the members of municipalities and district boards to grant certificates, such certificates are not taken into consideration by the chairmen of municipal councils or the presidents of district boards. The question arises whether the member who gives such certificates belongs to the chairman's party or the opposition. If he belongs to the chairman's party, the poverty certificate is given effect to. If otherwise, it is not valued. The only remedy for these difficulties would be to admit all Adi-Dravidas on half-fee concession straightaway. The Government have already realized that the depressed classes, Oriyas and Mussalmans are backward in their education, and ought to get a certain amount of encouragement. If they really want to help these people, I would suggest to them to accept my proposal. With these few remarks, I heartily support this resolution."

Mr. YAKUB HASAN—"Sir, I beg to move—

'that all words after the word "rule" be omitted.'

"Sir, when half-fee concession is to be given to Muslims, Oriyas and backward and depressed communities as a rule, the question of poverty certificate does not arise at all. So the words after the word 'rule' are

2nd November 1931] [Mr. Yakub Hasan]

unnecessary. There cannot be any doubt as to whether a particular pupil belongs to the Oriya or Muslim or a backward community. When half-fee concessions are to be granted to members of these backward classes, the question of poverty certificate does not arise. Therefore, I move that all these words be omitted."

AHMED MIRAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I second it."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Sir, I rise to speak in regard to the motion before the House, not on the amendment. I wish to mention one point to the hon. the Minister. So far as the managers of these private institutions are concerned, they are always willing to give half-fee concessions to Muhammadans and other depressed class members, because Government have really promised to compensate them for their loss of fee income. The complaint of the managers of these private institutions is that, though they get a promise in the beginning, in practice they are not convinced that it really is compensation for the fee income which they forego by awarding half-fee concessions; because the Government make only an award of a lump sum, and they do not inform the management how that amount was arrived at, so that they are practically in the dark as to what proportion of the full amount of grant represents their contribution to the net cost of management and what proportion represents these backward-classes concessions. It is sometimes easier to find out the basis of a levy of income-tax, but not the process by which these grants are made by the Director of Public Instruction's office. I would make an appeal to the hon. the Minister to see that the managers of these institutions get a proportion of the grants really representing the loss of fee income by way of half-fee concessions. If only these managements are assured that they are really getting what they have foregone by these fee concessions, they will be only too ready to help the Muslims and depressed class communities."

Mr. MAHBOOB ALI BAIG:—"I am reliably informed that prior to 1920, Muhammadans were given concession whether they were rich or poor. I suppose the reason for that must have been the fact that the Government wanted to encourage education among Muslims. I do not know what transpired afterwards which made this change necessary. I am aware, Sir, that there is a rule in the Education Department Code that half-fee concession must be given to certain classes as a rule and that in cases of doubt, poverty certificates must be called for. The only difficulty is that it has been interpreted by different institutions in different ways. According to my interpretation, as soon as a student belonging to any one of these communities applies for admission to a college or school, he must straightaway be admitted on half-fee concession and only in cases of doubt should the heads of institutions have power to require the student to produce a poverty certificate. That is my reading and interpretation of this rule. But what is actually happening in the colleges and schools is different. When students belonging to these communities go to a school, they are asked to pay full fee and, if they say that they belong to the poorer communities, they are asked to produce poverty certificates. There is no question

4-15
P.M.

[Mr. Mahboob Ali Baig] [2nd November 1931]

of admitting them on half-fee as a rule and asking for the production of poverty certificates in cases of doubt. They have reversed the process of this rule. Many such cases have been brought to my notice. In the Maharaja's College at Cocanada and in a certain school at Chica-cole, the students belonging to the Muslim community and the depressed classes mentioned in the rule are not given half-fee concession at all. Under these circumstances, my submission is that the Government must make it clear to these institutions that the interpretation of this rule is this, that is, that they should straightaway admit the students belonging to these communities on half-fee and that only in cases of doubt they should ask for the production of poverty certificates.

“Sir, it may be asked, where is the difficulty for the production of this certificate. As the House is aware, the parents of the students belonging to these communities are ignorant. In the first place they do not know the real procedure. If they are asked to produce a certificate, they go to a Magistrate or other authority mentioned in the rule. This authority asks them to go to the village munsif for the purpose. Sir, cases have been brought to my notice in which the village munsifs have not ordinarily granted these certificates. Then, Sir, as stated by the previous speaker, it is only persons with some influence in the locality or members of local bodies that generally get these certificates. When this happens, the really needy persons do not get the concession. That is the reason why the resolution says that students and pupils belonging to these communities must in the first instance be admitted at half-fee rates. We are all aware that the heads of these institutions generally know whether the parents of the boys seeking admission are or are not poor. In such cases, there is no necessity for the production of this certificate at all. It is only in cases of doubt that students should be asked to produce poverty certificates.

“The second part of this resolution says that when poverty certificates are produced from the authorities mentioned in the rule, they must be accepted. That has not been the case in several instances. In spite of the fact that certificates have been produced, no such concessions have been given. There would have been no necessity for a resolution of this kind if really the rule as it stands had been correctly interpreted and applied by the private schools and schools managed by local bodies. There is a real grievance now and I appeal to the hon. the Minister for Education to take early steps in this matter and do the needful to see that the local boards and private aided institutions conform to the provisions of this rule and not deviate from them for any reason whatever.”

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—“I hope, Sir, the House will pardon me if I venture to say that the real issue has been missed so far. Sir, the policy of the Government until a few years ago was that as the Muslim community was behind other communities in the matter of modern education. English education, as the community was not taking to English education as easily as the other communities in this Presidency and as this community deserved encouragement to enable

2nd November 1931] [Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

it to take to English education — the community had great reluctance towards European education, modern education or Christian education as they then conceived of it — the members of the community should be allowed to enter and be admitted in colleges and schools and in all educational institutions, public or private, at half-fee concession. Up to a certain stage, this policy did work very well; but later on, suddenly, without any facts and without any statistics before them to justify their action, the Government changed their policy and presumed that the Muslim community had come up to the level of the other communities and that they did not require this concession any more. They therefore changed the rule. I contend, Sir, that the Government were not the least justified in changing this rule which enabled Muslim students to be admitted on half-fees. The fact still remains — I do not know what the hon. Minister is going to say — that the Muslim community has not progressed to any appreciable extent in the matter of English education. There are still large sections of the community who are averse to modern education. They still think only of religious instruction and religious education alone. If the Government have any interest in the Muslim community progressing in education, then I say that the rule which they unwarrantably changed ought to be restored. The half-fee concession allowed on condition of the production of poverty certificate has no doubt worked very many difficulties in the case of the really deserving students. People with influence, people with a certain amount of acquaintance with the revenue authorities, have been able easily to produce poverty certificates and have sought admission and have been admitted into the educational institutions without difficulty. The poor people could not do it. That is so. I am not oblivious of what the hon. Minister is going to say, namely, that there cannot be any reason why the rich people in the Muslim community should not pay. That argument is no doubt very difficult to meet, if we have in view the standpoint that poverty alone is standing in the way of the Muslim community taking to modern education. I assert that the Muslim community is not behind the other communities in education solely on account of poverty. It is behind other communities in this matter on account of its deep-rooted attitude towards modern education and on account of its distaste for English education. Their aversion to English education persists still, although the late Sir Syed Ahmed Khan succeeded in getting rid of it to a large extent. And when this aversion persists, the question of poverty or no poverty does not arise. I do not say that the rich among the Muslim community ought not to pay for the education of their children. Far from that, the real position is that the Muslim community has not yet realized the advantages of modern education and seen its way to come up to the level of the other communities in the matter of English education and yet the Government have withdrawn the concession. On the contrary, the Government should have continued it. Therefore, I say, Sir, that the change was neither authorized nor warranted.

“ Now, what the Government have to do if the Muslim community should take to education just as the other communities, is to take away

[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed] [2nd November 1931]

that rule and bring about the old status to prevail. I entirely agree with Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti when he says that the reason why the private aided and the local board schools are not granting half-fee concessions to Muslim and depressed class students is that the Government are not now making special grants to such institutions, and these institutions are not sure that they will be compensated for the loss of fee income. I would therefore suggest that the hon. Minister should revert back to the old policy which was introduced in 1920 inasmuch as the Muslim community has not made any appreciable progress in the field of education and thereby assure the aided institutions that the loss of fee income would be paid to them if they admitted Muslim pupils."

Khan Bahadur T. M. MOIDOO SAHIB Bahadur:—"Coming as I do from Malabar which is a very backward district (Voices: 'No') backward so far as Muslim education is concerned, I must say a word on behalf of this resolution. The Mappillas as a rule are very backward in education and it was with great difficulty that they were induced to take advantage of this half-fee concession. With the relaxation of this rule granting half-fee concession there has been a set back in the education of the Mappillas. Recently, the Malabar District Board passed a resolution restoring the half-fee concession to the Mappilla students of Ernad and Walluvanad, the two taluks of the Malabar district where illiteracy predominates. Somehow or other, though the board was willing to give that concession, the Government in their Education department did not see eye to eye with the board. So much so, this resolution was not put into operation.

4-30
p.m.

"On more than one occasion, the unanimous verdict of the board was in favour of giving half-fee concession. At the present time when there is a move on the part of the Government to investigate into the question of Muhammadan education in this Presidency and do something, I think it will not be out of order if this House gives a unanimous vote in favour of this resolution. The Mappillas as a rule are very poor, especially in the Ernad and Walluvanad taluks, though in other portions of the district they are very rich. As some previous speakers said, they do not know the value of education. They may spend Rs. 200 on fire-works during the marriages of their children. But they will never pay annas 10 as school fees when it comes to that. It is only ignorance that is the cause of this state of things and this has been the cause of some trouble all over the country, especially in Malabar. To get over such difficulties, it is wise on the part of Government to spend some money on the education of these Mappillas rather than on jails and other things. I therefore humbly request this House to adopt this resolution as framed by the mover, considering the present difficulties under which we are labouring."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, the object of the motion, as I understood from both the Mover and the Seconder, is to make a recommendation to the Government that the present rules with regard to half-fee concession be revised and poverty certificates be insisted upon only in cases of

2nd November 1931] [Mr. S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar]

doubt. So far as that point is concerned, the existing rule No. 92 lays down exactly what my hon. Friends do desire to have now. Rule 92 of the Madras Educational Rules says that students of the classes mentioned there should be charged only one-half of the rates actually in force in the institution, provided the guardian or the parent concerned is so poor that a grant of this concession is necessary to enable the student to continue his studies. The production of the poverty certificate should be required only in cases of doubt. That is what is exactly provided for in the rule which has already been framed by the Government. So far as the obligation on the part of the management to grant this concession is concerned, the rule makes that also clear; because the rule says that in the case of those pupils whose parents are poor, the management *shall* levy only half rates. It gives them no option to levy a higher rate. Therefore, on both the points on which the hon. the Mover, the Seconder and some other hon. Friends have spoken, there is already ample provision in the rule as it exists at present. With regard to the actual working of the rule, the question was investigated some years ago and the Director of Public Instruction reporting on the working of this rule said that the initial responsibility with regard to the working of this rule rested upon the head-masters and the managers concerned. If the head-master is of opinion that the parents of a student of a backward class are poor and that the grant of this beneficial concession is necessary, such student shall have the half-fee concession without any further consideration and in cases of doubt, the poverty certificate prescribed is called for. That is how the rule has been worked according to the report of the Director of Public Instruction. My hon. Friends have now said that difficulties are experienced. No such difficulties till now have been brought to the notice of Government. The rule is clear: if any difficulty has arisen, it must be with regard to the actual working of the rule. In view of the observations that have been made on the floor of this House, I am prepared to communicate a copy of this discussion to the Director of Public Instruction and in the light of these discussions to issue necessary instructions to see that the rule which has been framed by the Government is observed in practice; and I think, if this is done, it must satisfy hon. Members."

MR. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"What about other points with regard to management? Will you give us an assurance?"

THE HON. DIWAN BAHADUR S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"The rules do provide that in addition to the grant otherwise payable to a school, the management will also be paid a grant equal to the loss in fee income owing to the award of fee-concessions. If instances of violation of the rule are brought to the notice of the Government, I shall certainly examine them and see that such further action as may be necessary is taken."

"With regard to all the other points raised by hon. Members, provision on the lines which they require has already been made in the

[Mr. S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar] [2nd November 1931]

rules by the Government. With regard to the working of those rules, information so far available to the Government is that they have been worked properly. But if in the light of the discussion any further enquiry is needed and further instructions called for, I shall see that such instructions are issued. If it is urged that any further concessions ought to be granted at this time of financial stringency, I do not think it is possible to give any such undertaking. I may remind hon. Members of the House that of the several points that have been specifically referred to the Muslim Education Committee, of which several hon. Members of this House are already Members, this point, viz., whether further concession ought to be given to Muslims, is one. On their recommendation what further action will have to be taken will have to be decided. The points referred to by my hon. Friends, Messrs. Patnaik and Devadasan, are points which are not covered by the resolution of which notice has been given. Those are matters which require independent consideration, but they are certainly not relevant to the resolution which is now before us. So far as this resolution is concerned, all that I can undertake to do is, to communicate a copy of the discussion that has taken place and also issue any instructions, if necessary, to the Director of Public Instruction, to see that the rules are observed in toto."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"In view of the assurance given by the hon. Minister, I beg leave to withdraw my resolution."

The resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

(5) SUPPLY OF WATER TO SALEM TOWN FROM METTUR RESERVOIR

Diwan Bahadur S. ELLAPPA CHETTIYAR:—"I beg to move the resolution that stands in my name which runs as follows:—

'This Council recommends to the Government that steps should be taken to supply water to Salem town from Mettur Reservoir for drinking purposes at an early date.'

"Sir, in moving this resolution, I do not propose to advance the same arguments that were made in support of a similar resolution moved by me on 29th January 1930. It is a well-known fact that Salem town is in need of good and sufficient drinking water. It is also admitted that Government have completely failed to satisfy the needs of the people in the past. The Government have refused to supply water from Mettur dam even for drinking purposes, if not for irrigation purposes. His Excellency the Governor has seen the place very carefully and realized the difficulties which the poor inhabitants of Salem were undergoing for getting drinking water. So I think it is not necessary for me to say much in order to impress upon the mind of the hon. the Chief Minister the urgent necessity of supplying drinking water to the people of Salem. When I moved a resolution on the

2nd November 1931] [Mr. S. Ellappa Chettiyar]

same subject, the then Minister for Public Health in accepting my resolution said as follows:—

‘Government will accept this resolution to the extent that Government will take all possible steps to try and persuade the Municipal Council to provide water-supply to the town of Salem.’

“ They also said that the matter was under investigation and it was possible to supply water to Salem from Mettur dam. In reply to an interpellation of mine regarding the supply of water from Mettur dam, it was said that investigation was completed and the Government were examining the financial aspect of the whole question.

“ Sir, Government are sympathetic but they are always confronted with financial stringency. I am afraid there will be no salvation for the people of Salem if the Government are going to repeat the same reply, viz., financial stringency every time. It is very long since this reply was given and I am strongly of opinion that the Government should at once come forward to rescue the people of Salem by sanctioning two-thirds of the cost, the balance to be met by the Salem Municipal Council. Instead of doing this, if Government were to expect the major portion from the Municipal Council the financial position of which is very poor, there will be no solution of this problem. If Government were to do like this, it would mean that the Government want to shelve the whole thing, and go back on the assurance which they gave on 30th January 1930 on the floor of this House, viz., that Government would take all possible steps and try to provide the Municipality with water supply. So, in view of that assurance, the hon. the Minister in charge will be kind enough to accept my resolution. My chief object in moving this resolution is to request the hon. the Chief Minister to give us a statement as to how the financial question between the Government and the Municipal Council stands and make him persuade the hon. the Finance Member to provide some funds for this purpose at least in the coming budget for beginning the preliminaries of the scheme and also to see that the scheme is given a start at an early date without the same being postponed on the plea of financial stringency.

“ With these few words, I move the resolution.”

* Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—“ I second the resolution which has been moved by my hon. Friend from Salem. With regard to water supply to Salem, this matter has been investigated for a long time and as far as I know, the difficulty seems to be the cost of pumping that will have to be carried out at Mettur if water is to be brought to Salem from Mettur. The contention of the municipality seems to be that this pumping operation costs them about Rs. 60,000 a year and that they will not be able to pay from their taxation. One of the chief concessions that the municipality wanted from the hon. Minister was that this should be done free of cost. I believe the Minister said that he would consider the matter favourably and that he would also place this matter before His Excellency. His Excellency also during his recent visit after

[Dr. P. Subbarayan] [2nd November 1931]

4-45
p.m.

seeing the state of water-supply in Salem and after inspecting the spot, was very sympathetic to the proposal but he also pleaded financial stringency. If this question of financial stringency is to stand in the way there will be no solution. I would also like to mention in this connexion that already the people of Salem have been taxed with regard to a water-supply scheme that has failed. Government thought that the Panamarathupatti scheme would give all the supply of water that is needed for the town of Salem but that scheme has failed, and all the money that the municipality spent on it has become a waste. But that could not be anticipated at that time. Both the municipality and the Government thought at that time that this scheme could give a constant supply of water to Salem town. This having failed and the people of Salem having willingly taxed themselves for this, it will be hard on them if they should be asked to pay once more for another scheme. I submit that they should not be asked to pay Rs. 60,000 or so which has been estimated to be the cost of raising water at Mettur. I hope the hon. Minister will consider the case of Salem favourably and see what he can do to help it."

* Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDAR:—"Sir, this question has been engaging the attention both of the Salem Municipal Council and the Government for a sufficiently long time, but no substantial benefit has resulted till now. Recently His Excellency the Governor also graced our district with a visit and he was personally convinced that the present water-supply is quite inadequate for Salem. Having got personal knowledge of the real situation through the head of the Province and the Members of his Cabinet, I hope the Government will not now put forward the plea of financial stringency in the case of such an urgent need as this, but manage to take up the scheme on hand at once and get it finished bit by bit at least in the course of some years, if not all at once.

"The hon. the Leader of the Opposition referred to the question of pumping operation to be done at Mettur. I understand that the Government are going to put up an electric installation for the purpose of working the dam line at Mettur and so I venture to suggest that it can be conveniently spared free of charge for pumping operations, thereby reducing the maintenance cost to be met by the municipality year by year. I understand the Government will lose nothing by allowing the installation to be used for this purpose in order to save for the municipality an unbearable annual recurring charge.

"In fine, I once again request the Government in all humility to consider the urgent need of Salem for an adequate supply of drinking water and accept this resolution and to take immediate steps to give all possible aid to the municipality for the early commencement of the work."

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, I am rather in a difficulty as to what exactly is the attitude that I should take on this question. We are not in possession of complete information with regard to the scheme for supplying Salem with water from Mettur.

2nd November 1931] [Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar]

I had something to do with the question of supplying Mettur water for Salem some time ago and I believe some investigations have been made. I believe, if I am right, they estimated that it would cost Rs. 28,00,000 to supply Salem with water from Mettur.

“ Apart from the Mettur scheme, the possibility of supplying Salem with water from other sources has not been completely investigated. I made a suggestion that investigation should be made as to the possibility of diverting the whole of the Panamarathupatti stream into the tank. At present only a small supply channel is taken from it and the bulk of the water is allowed to go down. It was stated at the time that irrigation rights under the main stream would have to be acquired if the whole stream had to be diverted. But considering that the Mettur scheme would cost about Rs. 28,00,000 it is highly desirable that we should exhaust all other possibilities before we take up the Mettur scheme.

“ In this connexion, I may remark that most of our sanitary schemes—water-supply schemes—are exceedingly costly. I have been insisting, whenever I had the power to do so, that the cost should be made as low as possible. I had suggested that instead of using cast iron and steel pipes, we should consider the possibility of using masonry conduits and things like that by carrying channels on a contour instead of having pressure pipes. I must say that experts have always been against considering the question I have raised. They have always insisted on using cast iron and steel pipes. If this expert opinion should prevail for all time, I am afraid it would be many many years and even centuries before all the cities in this Presidency are supplied with a protected water-supply. I want to know whether, in connexion with the scheme for supplying water to Salem from Mettur, the possibility of taking the water along contour line instead of crossing valleys necessitating pressure pipes, has been considered. Have they considered the possibility of using masonry conduits which can be done at a very small cost as compared with cast iron and steel pipes? If it was not possible to find any other source of supply except Mettur, we have to fall back on Mettur alone. Then of course other questions will arise. I believe the contention of the municipality was that Government should supply electric power free of cost, because it was developed at Mettur. I believe the estimated cost of power supply was somewhere about Rs. 60,000 a year. Even if Government agreed to grant this power free of cost, I am afraid the cost of the pipe line will be a very serious item indeed. I certainly am second to none in saying that Salem should be supplied with protected water-supply, but we ought to put a limit somewhere. I do not think, if we went on sanctioning schemes so costly as for example the Coimbatore Water-supply Scheme costing Rs. 42,00,000, we would ever make any progress in the way of giving a protected water-supply to all the cities in the Presidency. Unless sanitary experts are in a position to put forward cheaper schemes, the problem of providing protected water-supply to the whole of the Presidency will never be solved. I would therefore hesitate very much before I recommend the very costly scheme of supplying water to Salem from Mettur unless all other alternatives were exhausted, and secondly unless Government gave an assurance

[Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar]

[2nd November 1931]

that they would try to make the scheme as cheap as possible by using cheap materials and adopting other devices to reduce the cost of the scheme.

“ I know that Salem is very badly off for water and it is the duty of the Government to do all that is possible to give the town a protected water-supply. I believe some years ago a supplementary scheme was sanctioned for an infiltration gallery below the tank. I do not know what the result of the scheme is. Possibly it was thought at that time that it would lead to some improvement. But later on it might not have met the requirements of an increasing population. Of course it is the duty of the Government to do something to improve the water-supply of Salem, but I hope that before they undertook the very costly Mettur scheme they would consider other possible alternatives and do all that is possible to reduce the heavy estimated cost of the scheme.”

* Subadar-Major S. A. NANJAPPAH Bahadur:—“ Mr. President, Sir, the question of a protected water-supply scheme for Salem has been under consideration since 1927. Many high officials of Government, Members and Ministers, and even His Excellency the Governor who visited Salem have been impressed with the urgency of the problem in Salem. A resolution was also passed in this Council, but nothing substantial has been done till now. The municipality which is suffering from chronic poverty has not got sufficient funds to finance the scheme and they have been approaching Government to help them with funds to the extent of two-thirds of the cost, while they themselves would bear the remaining one-third. His Excellency the Governor also laid stress on the financial stringency of the province and the consequent inability of Government to finance the scheme at present. But the sad plight of over a lakh of people in the town has to be considered. Recently although there was 2 inches of rain in Salem, the Panamarathupatti tank got only 6 inches of water. Salem is an industrial centre and most of the people are weavers who require a large supply of water. One result of this insufficient supply is the periodical visit of epidemic diseases. The people of Salem have spent over 9 lakhs of rupees for the Panamarathupatti tank scheme which has been a failure. We cannot, in fairness to them, ask them to pay more. The taxes are already too high. I hope that Government will do something at once to come to the aid of the people of Salem and before long give them a protected water-supply.”

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—“ Sir, the subject of a protected water-supply for Salem has come before this Council more than once. The investigation of this scheme was ordered only in April 1930. The Sanitary Engineer submitted a scheme shortly afterwards. The scheme had to be re-examined with reference to the possibility of substituting electric power to work the pumps instead of water power. A conference was held at Ootacamund on the 11th May 1931 and as a result of the decisions then taken, the experts of the department were asked to submit fresh proposals. The Sanitary Engineer submitted four proposals—really two batches of proposals—one for the purpose of supplying Salem town alone and the other for the purpose of supplying Salem town and all the villages along the pipe line also.

2nd November 1931] [Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

The one that is cheaper according to him, costs Rs. 21,43,000 and will supply Salem town alone; the other which will supply the villages also on the pipe line will cost Rs. 22,54,000. The working charges will come to Rs. 74,000 for the one scheme and Rs. 94,000 for the other scheme. The Municipal Council has been addressed on the 21st October last asking which of the two schemes it would take up and how it proposed to finance it.

"No doubt in the order it has been stated that they must be prepared to bear the major portion of the expenditure. They were asked to state definitely to what extent they can finance the scheme. The Government have not yet received their reply on these points, and after the reply is received, the Government will consider it as anxiously as possible. I can only say this: that Salem requires decent water-supply is recognized by all. Recently in reply to an address from the Salem people, when His Excellency visited that place, he said to the following effect: 'I feel sure that you will understand that, in these circumstances, it is somewhat premature for the Government to commit themselves as to the exact proportion of the amount of loan they will be able to give or as to the terms under which electric power can be supplied. You may however rest assured that I feel that there is imperative need for good water-supply and will do as much to help you.' I cannot add anything more to that. As to the suggestions made by my hon. Friend, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, I shall certainly forward them to the Sanitary Engineer and ask him what remarks he has to offer on them."

Diwan Bahadur S. ELLAPPA CHETTIYAR:—"In view of the assurance given by the hon. Minister that he will expedite the scheme, I withdraw my motion."

The resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

The House then adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. the next day.

V.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

1. ^a *Press Communiqués issued in connection with the meetings of the Retrenchment Committee held on the 21st to 24th and 26th October 1931.*

2. ^b *G.O. No. 2496 W., dated 3rd October 1931, issuing rules for the use of, and regulation of traffic on, the Nilambur-Kalikavu-Karuvarkundu Road.*

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

^a Printed as Appendix VIII on pages 473-476 infra.

^b Published in the Fort St. George Gazette.

[2nd November 1931]

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to question No. 454 asked by Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd November 1931, page 346 supra.]

(True copy from "Swarajya", dated 10th September 1931.)

ADVICE TO VILLAGE OFFICERS.

Collector's circular.

CHITTOOR AGAIN!

(From a correspondent.)

CHITTOOR, September 9.

The following is a copy of the emergent order issued on 22nd August to all village officers in the Chittoor district by the Collector, and distributed in the Chandragiri taluk by the Tahsildar:

Emergent order to all village magistrates and the karnams.

It is published in the newspapers that the pact between Gandhi and the Government is broken. You must hereafter consider that the Congressmen are the enemies of the Government. The District Collector has notified that every action of theirs, viz., meetings, processions, propaganda, etc., must be put down without being carried on in the least. Therefore, whenever Congressmen or any one connected with them carry on any meetings, processions or propaganda in your villages, you must forthwith send reports through the village mudam (servant) in the report book to the police and to the Sub-Magistrate of Tirupati, with full details and report that fact to us on ordinary paper. Severe action will be taken against the village officers who are negligent in this matter. The list herewith sent should be signed in token of the receipt of this notice and the list should be returned. Very emergent.

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to question No. 455 asked by Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd November 1931, page 346 supra.]

*Proceedings of the Stationary Sub-Magistrate, Chittoor,
dated the 12th July 1931.*

Read—the following:—

(1) Report of the Circle Inspector of Police, Chittoor, dated the 12th July 1931.

(2) Sworn statement recorded from the above.

Cr. Misc. P. No. 1 of 1931.

Order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code.

Whereas information has been laid before me by the Circle Inspector of Police, Chittoor, that some of the members of the Congress Committee,

2nd November 1931]

Chittoor, headed by Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar, B.A., B.L., Advocate, Chittoor, started picketing at Chittoor on 11th July 1931,

that the picketers trespassed into the licensed premises of the Kattamanchi toddy shop and refused to leave the same even though requested to do so by the renter and in consequence of which feeling ran high between the renter and the Congress picketers, which led to bandying of threatening words at each other,

that the picketing started yesterday was obviously a vindictive measure directed against the toddy shop renter who persisted in bidding at the sale and taking the lease of the toddy shop in spite of being warned by Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar to desist from bidding at the sales,

that the picketing far from being peaceful, caused a nuisance to the law abiding citizens, by causing obstruction to the traffic,

that certain rowdy elements caused a breach of the peace by throwing stones and toddy bowls at the people on account of which an Excise peon got injured and one Mr. Seetharama Ayyar sustained slight injury and one Nabhikhan Sahib narrowly escaped being hit by a bowl,

that the picketers who were stationed at the entrances to the toddy shop on the west were also pelted with stones,

that the persons who were (sic) resorted to the toddy shop to drink took up an offensive attitude by jeering at the picketers and rebuking them which would have led to a breach of the peace but for the presence of the Police on the spot;

whereas it has been made to appear to me that the further picketing of toddy shops if resorted to at present would lead to a breach of the peace and cause danger to the personal safety of the people including the picketers;

and as I am also satisfied that there is sufficient ground for proceeding under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, and as this is a matter of urgency which does not admit the services of notices on the persons to whom this order is directed, I, M.R.Ry. M. M. Chinna Dorai, B.A., Stationary Second-class Magistrate, Chittoor, hereby direct you (1) M.R.Ry. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar Avargal, B.A., B.L., Advocate, Chittoor, (2) M.R.Ry. M. Ananthaseyanam Ayyangar, B.A., B.L., Pleader, Chittoor, (3) M.R.Ry. K. Varadachariar, B.A., B.L., Pleader, Chittoor, and (4) M.R.Ry. C. G. Jayaram Ayyar, B.A., Pleader, Chittoor, in particular and the law abiding public in general to abstain from picketing liquor shops in Chittoor and within a radius of 5 miles from Chittoor for a period of one month from this date.

Given under my hand and seal of this Court, this the 12th day of July 1931.

M. M. CHINNA DORAI,
Stationary Sub-Magistrate.

[2nd November 1931]

APPENDIX III.

[Vide answer to question No. 458 asked by Rao Sahib B. Venkataramayya at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd November 1931, page 348 supra.]

Comparative statement of suits and appeals in the High Court and Subordinate Civil Courts in the Presidency.

HIGH COURT.

Suits.			Appeals.		
1929.	1930.	1931.	1929.	1930.	1931.
154	169	185	920	966	871

SUBORDINATE CIVIL COURTS.

Suits.					
1929.		1930.		1931.	
O.S.	S.C.	O.S.	S.C.	O.S.	S.C.
28,370	48,359	25,876	48,756	22,261	59,906
Appeals.					
Appeals.	C.M. As.	Appeals.	C.M. As.	Appeals.	C.M. As.
2,986	36	2,871	34	2,489	39

APPENDIX IV.

[Vide answer to question No. 475 asked by Pandit Ganala Ramamurti at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd November 1931, page 358 supra.]

* 1747 Q.—MR. A. HARISCHANDRUDU NAYUDU: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the loss of revenue incurred by the Government every year during the last five years on account of the silting up of the bed of the Godavari river in the neighbourhood of the Godavari railway bridge;

(b) whether any attempts have been made to remove the sand thus deposited; and, if so, when and with what result; and

(c) whether there is any correspondence between this Government and the Government of India regarding the Godavari railway bridge and its effect on the irrigation of the delta; and, if so, whether a copy of it can be placed on the table of the House?

2nd November 1931]

A.—(a) The Government are not aware that there has been any loss of revenue on this account.

(b) Steps have been taken to wash away as far as possible the sand shoals above the railway bridge at Rajahmundry and estimates for Rs. 10,200 and Rs. 4,350 have recently been executed. Nanal and other growth is being uprooted in the various shoals up to the anicut and the soil loosened to encourage the scouring action of flood water.

(c) There has been no such correspondence recently.

Mr. A. HARISCHANDRUDU NAYUDU:—"With reference to the answer to clause (c), may I ask the hon. the Revenue Member whether there was any correspondence at any time, and, if so, whether he will be pleased to place it on the table of the House?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"I believe there was some discussion at the time when the railway bridge was being constructed, but I do not remember to have seen any correspondence about it. The hon. Member will find considerable information in a note on this subject which was placed on the table of the House in answer to a question about the 1st of February 1929."

Mr. A. HARISCHANDRUDU NAYUDU:—"May I ask the hon. the Revenue Member whether Government do not apprehend danger to irrigation by the continual silting up due to the existence of the railway bridge at the present place?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"I cannot say it is due to that. The silting up is probably due more to the anicut than to the railway bridge."

APPENDIX V.

[Vide answer to question No. 489 asked by Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd November 1931, page 369 supra.]

G.O. Ms. No. 852, Public, dated 18th August 1931.

In Memorandum No. 3598/25-3, Public, dated 31st January 1927, the following classes of unpassed clerks in the Registration department were brought under paragraph 3 of G.O. No. 949, Public, dated 5th November 1926:—

Class I.—Four hundred and eighty-seven clerks appointed before 1st March 1921, who were exempted up to specified limits of pay in the old graded scale of pay, seventeen by the Government and the rest by the Inspector-General of Registration.

[2nd November 1931]

Class II.—One hundred and seventy-three clerks also appointed before 1st March 1921, and not exempted in the old graded scale, but specifically exempted by the Inspector-General in the time-scale of pay with reference to paragraph 4 of G.O. No. 164, Law (Education), dated 4th February 1925.

Class III.—Thirty-eight clerks confirmed on or after 1st March 1921, of whom twenty-three were specifically exempted by the Inspector-General.

2. The following irregularities have been committed in respect of the above classes of clerks:—

(a) *Class I clerks.*—With reference to G.O. No. 722, Law (Education), dated 13th June 1922, the Inspector-General did not specifically exempt any of these 487 clerks in the time-scale of pay, but issued general instructions enabling them to draw increments in the time-scale, quoting G.O. No. 1525, Law (Education), dated 8th December 1922. As they had been exempted only up to specified limits in the graded scale of pay, they could draw in the time-scale of pay only the pay represented by the limit of exemption plus the temporary increase in pay. They were, however, irregularly granted increments with effect from 1st March 1921.

(b) *Class II clerks.*—The Inspector-General exempted all these 173 clerks between the 14th and 27th May 1926, i.e., after the issue of G.O. No. 773, Law (Education), dated 3rd May 1926, which withdrew the power of exemption from the heads of departments.

(c) *Class III clerks.*—Of the twenty-three clerks who were specifically exempted by the Inspector-General, twenty were allowed to count service for increments from or after the dates of their exemption, but the three remaining clerks, viz., S. Padmanabha Rao, C. N. Raghavendra Rao, and K. Annayya Acharya, serving in Coimbatore district, were allowed irregularly to count service for increments from 1st March 1921 instead of from 17th March 1921, the date of their exemption, by the Inspector-General.

3. The Government have perused the explanation offered by the Inspector-General and the remarks of the Accountant-General for these irregularities and are pleased to issue the following orders:—

(1) The eleven clerks belonging to class I, shown in Annexure A to these proceedings who had been originally exempted by the Government up to specified limits in the old graded scale of pay will be allowed to draw their present rates of pay and rise in the time-scale of Rs. 35—60 up to the bar. There will be no reduction of pay or recovery in their cases.

(2) As regards the other six clerks belonging to class I shown in Annexure B who had also been exempted by the Government up to specified limits in the old graded scale of pay, the pay of No. 1 has already been fixed at Rs. 50 per mensem in G.O. No. 94, Public, dated 31st January 1927, and Nos. 2 to 6 inclusive have been permitted in

2nd November 1931]

G.O. No. 772, Public, dated 23rd August 1927, to cross the bar in the scale of Rs. 35—60. No question, therefore, arises in these cases of any reduction of pay or recovery of overpayments.

(3) The other 470 clerks in class I, shown in Annexure C, will remain on their present rates of pay until they reach that pay by normal rises in the ordinary scale on the assumption that they have started on the minimum pay and counted service for increments from 31st January 1927, the date on which they were brought under paragraph 3 of G.O. No. 949, Public, dated 5th November 1926. Thereafter they may draw increments up to the bar.

(4) Clerks C. N. Raghavendra Rao and K. Annayya Acharya included in class III will remain in their present rates of pay until they reach that pay by normal rises in the ordinary scale assuming that they had started on the minimum pay and counted service for increments from 17th March 1921, the date of their exemption by the Inspector-General. Thereafter they may draw increments up to the bar.

Clerk S. Padmanabha Rao who was also irregularly allowed to draw increments from 1st March 1921 instead of from 17th March 1921, having since died, the question of refixation of his pay does not arise; the recovery of the amount overdrawn by him is waived.

(5) As regards the amounts overdrawn by the clerks mentioned in Annexure C and by clerks, C. N. Raghavendra Rao and K. Annayya Acharya, the Government direct that wherever it is established that the parties have not contributed by any act or omission to the incorrect drawal of excess amounts, the recovery of such amounts outstanding on the date of these proceedings shall be waived. Recoveries effected up to the date of these proceedings will not however be refunded.

(6) In regard to the exemption of the 173 clerks belonging to class II, the Inspector-General has explained that he exempted them prior to the receipt by him of a copy of G.O. No. 773, Law (Education), dated 3rd May 1926, i.e., under the *bona fide* belief that he had the power to do so. The Government accept this explanation and ratify the exemptions granted by the Inspector-General. As these 173 clerks were allowed to count service for increments only from the dates of their exemption by the Inspector-General there is no question of recovery of overpayments in their cases.

(By order of the Governor in Council)

C. F. V. WILLIAMS,
Under Secretary to Government in charge
of the Chief Secretariat.

To the Inspector-General of Registration, with reference to the correspondence ending with his letter No. E. 18, dated 17th June 1931.
„ Accountant-General, through the Finance Department, with reference to his letter No. Reg. 1-171, dated 15th May 1931 (T.A.D. Regn. III).

[2nd November 1931.]

ANNEXURES.

A.

Ganjam.

1. G. Gopalam.

Vizagapatam.

2. A. Parvatism.

Kistna.

3. P. Lakshminarayana.

Nellore.

4. Md. Ghouse Mohiuddin.

Kurnool.

5. G. Venkatasubbiah.
6. H. Subba Rao.

Anantapur.

7. T. Hassan Khan.

Chittoor.

8. Md. Khasim Sahib.

Coimbatore.

9. T. S. Srinivasa Rao.

Madras-Chingleput.

10. Muhammad Nawajuddin.

Madura.

11. V. R. Subrahmanya Ayyar.

B.

1. K. Venugopala Rao.
2. P. Peddaperi Sastri.
3. A. Kasipathi.
4. S. Ramacharlu.
5. D. Raghavendra Rao.
6. M. S. Appadurai Mudaliyar.

C.

Ganjam.

1. Nityananda Patnaik.
2. S. Veeresalingam.
3. B. Chiranjivi.
4. K. Venkataratnam.
5. Haricharan Patnaik.
6. T. Ramakrishnayya.
7. A. Mallikarjuna Rao.

Ganjam—cont.

8. Narayana Chōwdhari.
9. Saibo Behara.
10. Y. Veeranna.
11. Y. Appalanarasimham.
12. N. Ramamurti.

Vizagapatam.

13. S. V. Sudarsanam.
14. V. Suryanarayana.
15. A. Mallapparaju.
16. S. Audinarayana.
17. R. Venkateswarlu.
18. Ch. Viraraju.
19. M. Venkatanarasayya.
20. M. Viswanadham.
21. P. Viraraju.

East Godavari.

22. Ch. V. Subbayya.
23. Tanikella Seshayya.
24. N. Kodandaramaiah.
25. K. Sriramulu.
26. S. Hanumantha Rao.
27. D. V. Subba Rao.
28. K. Venkateswarulu.
29. Md. Salar.
30. Ch. Venkata Rao.
31. T. Kameswara Rao.
32. G. Balakrishna Rao.
33. G. Bhadrachalam.
34. W. Sanyasiraju.
35. A. Ramanujayya.
36. S. L. Narasimha Rao.
37. K. Mallapuraju.

West Godavari.

38. T. Raja Rao.
39. A. V. Seshagiri Rao.
40. T. Suryaprakasa Rao.
41. P. Bhashyakarulu.
42. C. V. Ramanayya.
43. Abdul Khader.
44. S. Somayajulu.
45. Ch. Venkiah.
46. J. Venkatarreddi.
47. K. Gopalam.
48. A. Narayana Rao.
49. N. Atchutaramiah.

2nd November 1931]

Kistna.

- 50. P. Raghunadha Rao.
- 51. A. Venkata Rao.
- 52. P. Ranganayakulu.
- 53. D. Rama Rao.
- 54. A. Jagannadha Rao.
- 55. V. V. Subba Rao.
- 56. P. V. Narasimha Rao.
- 57. K. Krishna Rao.
- 58. Ch. Narasimha Rao.
- 59. S. Kameswara Rao.
- 60. L. Jagannadha Rao.
- 61. M. L. Narasimha Rao.
- 62. P. Sriramulu.
- 63. S. Anantaramayya.

Guntur.

- 64. M. Venkateswarulu.
- 65. V. Krishna Rao.
- 66. P. Narasimha Rao.
- 67. D. Ramayya.
- 68. Md. Abdul Aziz Sahib.
- 69. K. Venkataramayya.
- 70. K. Venkatasubba Rao.
- 71. V. Venkata Achari.
- 72. G. Sitaramayya.
- 73. Ch. V. Gopala Rao.
- 74. V. Mukunda Rao.
- 75. Y. L. Narasimham.
- 76. B. S. S. Dikshitulu.
- 77. Md. Jamaluddin.
- 78. K. Kotiswara Rao.
- 79. Y. Nagabhushana Rao.
- 80. G. Kameswara Rao.
- 81. P. Sriramulu.
- 82. R. V. Raghava Sarma.

Nellore.

- 83. Panani Narasinga Rao.
- 84. Varanasi Suryanarayanayya.
- 85. Nandanavanam Kondayya.
- 86. Polavarapu Narayana Rao.
- 87. Kesanapalli Venkata Rao.
- 88. Y. V. Seshagiri Rao.
- 89. Saiyid Hayath Badsha Sahib.

Cuddapah.

- 90. P. Madhava Nayudu.
- 91. B. Hanumantha Rao.

Kurnool.

- 92. Syed Badruddin.
- 93. K. Venkoba Acharya.
- 94. P. Narasimha Sastri.
- 95. Shaikh Babji Sahib.

Bellary.

- 96. N. Rama Rao.
- 97. K. Subrahmanya Sastri.
- 98. H. Hanumanthachar.
- 99. T. Venkoba Rao.

Anantapur.

- 100. S. Narayana Rao.
- 101. Y. Nagesa Rao.

Chittoor.

- 102. C. Sivasankara Mudaliyar.
- 103. C. Hanumantha Rao.
- 104. K. Narasimhachari.
- 105. S. Dathu Rao.
- 106. B. Sitaramayya.
- 107. K. Venkoba Rao.
- 108. R. Purushothama Nayudu.
- 109. V. Subbiah.
- 110. C. N. Krishna Rao.
- 111. T. Ramachandra Rao.
- 112. A. V. Margam Ayyar.
- 113. V. Seshacharya.
- 114. P. Ramachandra Ayyar.

North Arcot.

- 115. A. M. Krishnaswami Ayyar.
- 116. A. Nadamuni Nayudu.
- 117. N. Bojjayya Chetti.
- 118. G. Srihari Sastri.
- 119. M. Samanna Ayyar.
- 120. N. Murugesu Nayakar.
- 121. R. Rajam Nayudu.
- 122. M. Krishnaswami Mudaliyar.
- 123. P. R. Raju Pillai.
- 124. K. Krishna Pillai.
- 125. K. S. Venkatasubrahmanya Sarma.
- 126. P. Rama Rao.
- 127. P. Krishna Rao.
- 128. T. Kumaraswami Thambiran.
- 129. C. Venkatakrishnayya.
- 130. W. Venkataswami Nayakar.

[2nd November 1931]

North Arcot—cont.

- 131. S. Seshagiri Rao.
- 132. E. Subba Acharya.
- 133. S. K. Varadarajulu Chetti.

Salem.

- 134. P. S. Chelva Rao.
- 135. B. R. Appanniah.
- 136. K. S. Thrivikramachakravarthi.
- 137. M. Arumugam Pillai.
- 138. T. S. Swaminatha Ayyar.
- 139. V. Lakshmana Ayyar.
- 140. D. R. Ramasesha Ayyar.
- 141. D. N. Venkataramana Ayyar.
- 142. S. Ramasesha Ayyar.
- 143. S. Subbaraya Ayyar.
- 144. N. A. Abdul Gaffoor Sahib.
- 145. R. Venkata Rao.
- 146. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
- 147. T. A. Ramakrishna Ayyar.
- 148. A. Raghavendra Rao.
- 149. T. C. Sesha Ayyar.
- 150. V. S. Ramanatha Ayyar.
- 151. H. Ragothama Rao.
- 152. S. R. Srikanta Ayyar.
- 153. S. Venkataramana Ayyar.
- 154. K. C. Krishna Rao.
- 155. S. K. Subrahmanya Mudaliyar.
- 156. P. R. Hari Rao.
- 157. N. Viraswami Ayyangar.
- 158. R. Krishna Chetti.
- 159. K. Radhakrishna Mudaliyar.
- 160. P. A. Subba Rao.
- 161. A. Hayath Batcha Sahib.
- 162. S. Angamuthu Pillai.
- 163. V. Rangaswami Nayudu.

Erode.

- 164. A. S. Venkatasubrahmanya Ayyar.
- 165. V. Narayana Ayyar.
- 166. V. Guruswami Ayyar.
- 167. S. Subrahmanya Ayyar.
- 168. C. S. Subrahmanya Ayyar.
- 169. D. V. Bhima Rao.
- 170. C. V. Kuppanarasa Ayyar.
- 171. P. V. Subrahmanya Ayyar.

Erode—cont.

- 172. S. K. Rama Ayyar.
- 173. G. Venkatacuppa Ayyar.

Coimbatore.

- 174. V. V. Lakshmana Ayyar.
- 175. C. V. Ramaswami Ayyar.
- 176. P. J. Ebenezer.
- 177. T. R. Narayana Ayyar.
- 178. P. R. Venkatarama Pillai.
- 179. U. C. Marimuthu Boyan.
- 180. J. Sakkahari Rao.
- 181. P. V. Rama Rao.
- 182. C. K. Subrahmanya Ayyar.
- 183. N. Sankara Rao.
- 184. B. Venkoba Rao.
- 185. C. S. Dhondhu Rao.
- 186. T. S. Ganapathi Sastri.
- 187. V. Gopalakrishna Ayyar.
- 188. K. Subba Rao.
- 189. S. Suriya Pillai.
- 190. J. Venkatakrishna Ayyar.
- 191. Y. Venkataramana Ayyar.
- 192. N. B. Madhava Rao.

Palghat.

- 193. P. Rahiman Sheriff.
- 194. A. K. Abdul Khadir.
- 195. C. K. Sivaramakrishna Ayyar.
- 196. P. K. Anantanarayana Ayyar.
- 197. K. Sankunni Nayar.
- 198. V. K. Sankunni Nayar.
- 199. K. Achutha Ezhuthesan.
- 200. U. Govindan Nayar.
- 201. T. Chinkunni Taravanar.
- 202. K. S. Narayana Ayyar.
- 203. T. V. Govinda Ayyar.
- 204. P. S. Sesha Ayyar.
- 205. S. Sankaranarayana Sarma.
- 206. T. N. Kunhi Kuttan.
- 207. K. V. Ezhuthara Variyar.

Calicut.

- 208. S. A. Ahmed Hussain.
- 209. T. Krishna Menon.
- 210. C. Kunhikoya.
- 211. T. Mamoo.

2nd November 1931]

Calicut—cont.

- 212. K. Zainuddin Kutty.
- 213. V. Pokker.
- 214. A. Sankunni Nayar.
- 215. K. Damodara Menon.
- 216. U. Narayana Ayyar.
- 217. K. P. Velayudhan Nayar.
- 218. K. N. Kunhi Moideen.
- 219. N. A. Govindan Nayar.
- 220. K. E. Chakravunni Nayar.
- 221. P. V. K. Kunhi Kannan.
- 222. I. N. Sankunni Menon.
- 223. T. P. Karunakara Kurup.
- 224. K. P. Narayanan Nayar.
- 225. E. Kumaran.
- 226. M. Gopalan.
- 227. V. Gopala Menon.

Tellicherry.

- 228. K. N. Unni Nambiyar.
- 229. M. Gopalan Nambiyar.
- 230. M. Ummerkutty.
- 231. V. K. Narayanan.
- 232. M. Raman.
- 233. T. K. Raman Nambiyar.
- 234. Ch. Koman Nayar.
- 235. E. Raman Nayar.
- 236. C. V. Rama Ayyar.
- 237. K. Achyuthan.
- 238. K. Kanara Kurup.
- 239. V. Kammar Menon.
- 240. P. Krishna Kurup.
- 241. K. C. Anandan Nayar.
- 242. T. Kanna Kurup.
- 243. P. Rama Kurup.
- 244. P. Govindan.
- 245. Ch. K. Achuthan.
- 246. P. Ryr Nambiyar.
- 247. V. Govindan.
- 248. P. K. Govindan.
- 249. M. Sannavalla Mohajir.
- 250. K. Sankaran Nayar.
- 251. M. Damodaram.
- 252. G. K. Babjan.
- 253. K. Narayana Menon.
- 254. K. Narayanan Nambiyar.
- 255. C. V. Venkatarama Ayyar.
- 256. K. Krishnan Nayar.
- 257. C. Appu Nayar.

Tellicherry—cont.

- 258. K. K. Gopalan Nambiyar.
- 259. V. K. Govindan Nayar.
- 260. N. Muhammad Kutty.
- 261. M. K. Komappan Nambiyar.
- 262. P. Kunhappa.

South Kanara.

- 263. M. Venkata Rao.
- 264. P. Koragappa.
- 265. K. Rama Rao.
- 266. B. Janardhan Rao.
- 267. M. Subrayaprabhu.
- 268. P. Raman Nayar.
- 269. P. Appu.
- 270. A. Sunder Rao.
- 271. E. Padmanabhayya.
- 272. B. Achuta Pai.

Madras—Chingleput.

- 273. M. Arumuga Mudaliyar.
 - 274. M. Thangavelu Mudaliyar.
 - 275. S. M. Srinivasa Raghava Acharya.
 - 276. Md. Abdul Gaffoor.
 - 277. D. Ratnavelu Mudaliyar.
 - 278. M. R. Subrahmanya Ayyar.
 - 279. K. Tiruvenkata Mudaliyar.
 - 280. S. Kuppuswami Mudaliyar.
 - 281. S. Gundacharya.
 - 282. A. Narayanaswami Ayyar.
 - 283. G. Lakshmipathi Nayudu.
 - 284. C. M. Sundara Udayar.
 - 285. C. Rajagopala Tambiran.
 - 286. M. Satagopacharya.
 - 287. P. M. Chandrasekhara Mudaliyar.
 - 288. C. S. Ramanatha Pillai.
 - 289. S. Govindaraja Pillai.
 - 290. V. Hanumantha Rao.
 - 291. V. Rajamannar Chetti.
 - 292. N. Devarajulu Nayudu.
 - 293. C. A. Krishnaswami Ayyan-
gar.
 - 294. M. Ramakrishna Ayyar.
 - 295. M. N. Loganatha Mudaliyar.
- Villupuram.*
- 296. T. S. Krishnamurthi Ayyar.
 - 297. K. Hyderkhan.

[2nd November 1931]

Villupuram—cont.

- 298. B. Venugopala Pillai.
- 299. P. V. Narayanaswami Raju.
- 300. R. Muhammad Baig.
- 301. K. Rajamanikkam Pillai.
- 302. B. S. Rajagopala Pillai.
- 303. M. Ramanujam Nayudu.
- 304. V. Sarangapani Mudaliyar.

Cuddalore.

- 305. K. Md. Raza Khan.
- 306. D. Subrahmanya Ayya.
- 307. K. Subrahmanya Ayyar.
- 308. S. Natesa Ayyar.
- 309. R. Palamalai Pillai.
- 310. A. K. Balasubrahmanya Mudaliyar.
- 311. C. S. Ramaswami Sastri.
- 312. V. Subrahmanya Ayyar.
- 313. T. R. Muthuswami Ayyar.
- 314. K. Sirdar Khan.

Tanjore.

- 315. D. V. Chinnakrishnaswami Raja.
- 316. D. Ranga Raja.
- 317. T. P. Chandrasekhara Ayyar.
- 318. P. Nataraja Pillai.
- 319. T. R. Appuswami Rao.
- 320. N. Nagaraja Rao.
- 321. V. Krishnaswami Ayyangar.
- 322. N. Venkatarama Ayyar.
- 323. M. Adaikkalaswami Pillai.
- 324. T. K. Radhakrishna Nayudu.
- 325. D. Kolandavelu Pillai.

Negapatam.

- 326. D. Sundaram Ayyar.
- 327. S. Subrahmanya Ayyar.
- 328. S. Venkatachari.
- 329. A. Thiruvengadam Pillai.
- 330. S. Bhuvarahachari.
- 331. V. S. Venkatarama Ayyar.
- 332. R. Nagaraja Rao.
- 333. R. Govindarajulu Nayudu.
- 334. V. Ratnasami Ayyar.
- 335. T. Ramanatha Mudaliyar.
- 336. K. Aravamudu Ayyangar.
- 337. S. Venkatasubrahmanya Ayyar.

Trichinopoly.

- 338. T. S. Duraiswami Mudaliyar.
 - 339. T. C. Parthasarathi Nayudu.
 - 340. P. S. Venkatesa Ayyar.
 - 341. S. Krishna Rao.
 - 342. R. Srinivasa Rao.
 - 343. A. V. Venkatesa Ayyar.
 - 344. V. Subba Rao.
 - 345. C. M. Vasudeva Singh.
 - 346. A. Bhadrachalam Mudaliyar.
 - 347. T. R. Narayana Ayyar.
 - 348. T. A. Subbayya Pillai.
 - 349. L. R. Rajagopala Ayyar.
 - 350. I. Ibrahim Sheriff.
 - 351. K. Subrahmanya Ayyar.
 - 352. V. Subrahmanya Ayyar.
 - 353. V. Alagiriswami Raja.
 - 354. S. Viswanatha Ayyar.
 - 355. M. Sundaram Ayyar.
 - 356. C. K. Varadaraja.
 - 357. M. Sivasubrahmanya Pillai.
 - 358. V. Umamaheswara Ayyar.
 - 359. P. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.
 - 360. P. T. Krishnaswami Ayyangar.
 - 361. K. Rama Rao.
 - 362. S. Kuppuswami Ayyangar.
 - 363. M. Subrahmanya Ayyar.
 - 364. M. Venkatarama Deikshithar.
 - 365. N. Rajagopala Ayyangar.
 - 366. T. A. Sessa Ayyar.
 - 367. T. R. Muthukrishna Nayudu.
 - 368. M. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
 - 369. R. Kannappa Pillai.
 - 370. P. K. Kasturiranga Acharya.
 - 371. S. Venkata Rao.
 - 372. R. Raju Nayudu.
 - 373. B. Lakshminarasimha Nayudu.
 - 374. N. Krishnamacharya.
 - 375. Saiyid Badsha Mohiuddin.
 - 376. P. Palaniyandi Pillai.
 - 377. C. Ranga Raja.
 - 378. S. Venkataswami Raja.
- Madura.*
- 379. V. Sankaralingam Mudali.
 - 380. R. V. Kothandarama Ayyar.
 - 381. G. Subrahmanya Ayyar.
 - 382. C. R. Sundaram Ayyar.

2nd November 1931]

Madura—cont.

- 383. S. Veeraswami Ayyar.
- 384. P. Govinda Raja.
- 385. K. Jamaluddin Ravuttar.
- 386. R. Govindaswami Raja.
- 387. M. Subrahmanya Ayyar.
- 388. R. C. Srinivasa Ayyar.
- 389. S. Palaniappa Pillai.
- 390. M. Guruswami Pillai.
- 391. T. S. Satyamoorti Ayyar.
- 392. B. Srinivasa Rao.
- 393. N. Natesa Ayyar.
- 394. T. B. Subbuswami Rao.
- 395. C. Thiruvambalam Pillai.
- 396. R. Venkatarama Ayyar.
- 397. M. S. Abdul Rahman Sahib.
- 398. A. Rama Rao.
- 399. A. Ayyaswami Ayyar.
- 400. R. Desikachari.
- 401. L. Sundararaja Ayyangar.
- 402. L. Gopalakrishna Rao.
- 403. S. G. Govindaswami Nayudu.
- 404. S. Ramaswami Ayyangar.
- 405. James Daivanayagam.
- 406. N. Ramasubba Mudaliyar.
- 407. K. A. Sundaram Pillai.
- 408. A. Muthuswami Nayudu.
- 409. T. N. Lakshmana Rao.

Ramnad.

- 410. A. Balakrishna Pillai.
- 411. V. Ramaswami Ayyar.
- 412. V. N. Venkatasubrahmanya Ayyar.
- 413. E. Sundaram Pillai.
- 414. G. Rangaswami Ayyangar.
- 415. S. Sadasiva Ayyar.
- 416. V. Krishna Rao.
- 417. K. Raghunatha Rao.
- 418. M. A. Ramachandram Pillai.
- 419. G. Surappa Ayyar.
- 420. R. Nagaratnam Asari.
- 421. D. Muthuswami Ayyangar.
- 422. R. Ranga Ayyangar.
- 423. S. Ramaswami Ayyangar.
- 424. K. Kulatturasami Pillai.
- 425. S. Muthayya Ayyar.
- 426. N. Zynulabdin Sahib.
- 427. H. Krishna Ayyar.

Ramnad—cont.

- 428. M. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
- 429. I. Sikkander Mohiddin.
- 430. R. Vaikuntam Ayyar.
- 431. S. Sankara Ayyar.
- 432. R. A. Ramaswami Pillai.
- 433. N. Muthuswami Ayyar.
- 434. R. A. Appala Acharya.
- 435. N. Lakshmana Ayyar.
- 436. K. Mohiuddin Batcha Sahib.
- 437. K. Shanmugasundara Mudali.
- 438. T. V. Rama Rao.
- 439. R. Apatharana Ayyar.
- 440. N. Pethayya Pillai.
- 441. K. P. Subrahmanya Pillai.

Palamcottah.

- 442. V. Subbayya Nayudu.
- 443. M. Muthayya Kone.
- 444. D. Thiruvengkadatha Ayyangar.
- 445. S. Ramalingam Pillai.
- 446. P. S. Arunachalam Pillai.
- 447. C. Abdul Razakhan Sarvani.
- 448. K. Sankaranarayana Pillai.
- 449. T. S. Ulaganatha Pillai.
- 450. T. S. Vallinayagam Pillai.
- 451. V. P. Subbayya Pillai.
- 452. U. Mukka Pillai.
- 453. S. Munruyugamkondan Asari.
- 454. T. S. Manimuthu Pillai.
- 455. S. Muhammad Yacub Sahib.
- 456. K. S. Pichumani Ayyar.
- 457. D. Anantarama Ayyar.
- 458. N. S. Srinivasa Rao.

Tinnevelly.

- 459. T. K. Chidambaram Pillai.
- 460. T. Sivasaila Mudaliyar.
- 461. K. Ramaswami Ayyangar.
- 462. V. Vittal Rao.
- 463. R. Kulattu Ayyar.
- 464. K. A. Alagappa Pillai.
- 465. S. Saravanaperumal Pillai.
- 466. K. Sankaralingam Pillai.
- 467. K. Narayana Rao.
- 468. U. Kandasami Asari.
- 469. T. V. Subbayya Ayyar.
- 470. R. A. Ramaswami Nayudu.

[2nd November 1931]

APPENDIX VI.

[Vide answer to question No. 504 asked by Mr. A. B. Shetty at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd November 1931, page 381 supra.]

(1)

Statement of collections in first quarter and second quarter districtwar up to and ending with 30th September 1931.

Name of district.	In first quarter.		In second quarter.	
	Rs.	A.	Rs.	A.
Ganjam	11,315	8	11,065	0
Vizagapatam	27,947	8	24,850	0
East Godavari	18,567	8	17,147	8
West Godavari	7,822	8	8,897	8
Kistna	11,987	8	27,115	0
Guntur	15,625	0	14,802	8
Nellore	12,245	0	10,220	0
Cuddapah	6,177	8	6,047	8
Anantapur	8,927	8	8,945	0
Bellary	20,200	0	18,607	8
Kurnool	7,912	8	14,412	8
Chingleput	17,785	0	13,847	8
Chittoor	13,417	8	9,907	8
North Arcot	19,922	8	13,692	8
South Arcot	10,800	0	12,812	8
Tanjore	28,215	0	34,015	0
Trichinopoly	25,330	0	28,382	8
Madura	56,805	0	52,400	0
Ramnad	46,762	8	45,972	8
Tinnevely	31,267	8	30,740	0
Coimbatore	72,942	8	66,635	0
Nilgiris	56,897	8	44,265	0
Salem	36,767	8	35,042	8
South Kanara	33,305	0	33,602	8
Malabar	36,802	8	32,350	0
Madras City	1,72,455	0	1,57,210	0
Total ...	8,08,203	0	7,72,985	0

(2)

G.O. No. 1081, L. & M., dated 28th March 1931.

In pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931, the Board of Revenue, the Inspector-General of Police, the Commissioner of Police, the Superintendent, Government Press, and the Superintendent of Stationery are requested to submit to Government on the 15th April each year, a statement showing the expenses in connexion with the working of the above Act.

2. The method of annual payment to each local body from the proceeds of the tax will be as follows. The total sum due to local bodies

2nd November 1931]

has in the first instance been determined tentatively and for immediate purposes at 66 lakhs on the basis of the average gross revenue from tolls and vehicle tax on motor vehicles for three years ending 1929-30. The amount payable on this basis to each participating local body is shown in the appendix to this order. A detailed and more accurate adjustment of the compensation amounts is being worked out with reference to section 10 (2) (a), (b) and (c) and to the substitution of 1931 for 1930 in clause 10 (1). Any discrepancies in the amounts due to local bodies as a result of the rough and ready calculation adopted in the first instance will be adjusted later when the amount finally due to each local body is ascertained.

3. The sum of 66 lakhs as above will be taken as the basic amount for purposes of distribution in 1931-32. On 15th April 1931, three-sixteenths of the amount or $12\frac{3}{8}$ lakhs will be disbursed. On 15th July 1931 another three-sixteenths of the amount or $12\frac{3}{8}$ lakhs will be disbursed. On 15th October 1931 a further three-sixteenths of the amount or $12\frac{3}{8}$ lakhs will be disbursed. On 15th January 1932 a further three-sixteenths of the amount or $12\frac{3}{8}$ lakhs will be disbursed. Thus three-quarters of the amount due in 1931-32 will be paid within the year. The remaining quarter or such portion thereof as the proceeds of the tax will meet will be disbursed as soon as the net proceeds excluding charges of collection and the amount to be credited to Government under section 10 (1) (b) or 10 (3) can be ascertained definitely from the accounts. At the close of the year, that is to say, on the 31st March 1932, a rough estimate of the proceeds actually taken during the year will be made and if this new figure is less than 66 lakhs it will be substituted for the original 66 lakhs as the basic amount for distribution during 1932-33. Distribution for 1932-33 will then be made in the same in the same manner as above. The procedure for 1932-33 will be repeated for subsequent years.

(By order of the Government, Ministry of Local Self-Government)

HILTON BROWN,
Secretary to Government.

To the Inspector-General of Police.
 „ the Commissioner of Police.
 „ the Board of Revenue.
 „ the Superintendent, Government Press.
 „ the Superintendent of Stationery.
 „ all Presidents of District Boards.
 „ all Chairmen, Municipal Councils.
 „ all Collectors.
 „ the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.
 „ the Surgeon-General.
 „ the Director of Public Health.
 „ the Director of Public Instruction.
 „ the Examiner of Local Fund Accounts.
 „ the Accountant-General, through Finance.
 „ the Finance Department.
 „ the Law (Legislative), (Drafting) and (General) Departments.
 „ the Revenue Department.
 „ the Public (Police) Department.
 „ the Public Works and Labour Department.

[Appendix

[2nd November 1931]

Appendix.

(1) *Madras Corporation.*

	In thousands.
	RS.
Tolls	1,00
Vehicle taxation	2,75
Total	3,75 or
	3,75,000

(2) *District Boards.*

	In thousands.		In thousands.
	RS.		RS.
Anantapur	53	Madura	3,82
North Arcot	1,39	Malabar	2,30
South „	1,72	Nellore	48
Bellary	48	Nilgiris	1,31
Chingleput	1,48	Ramnad	2,84
Chittoor	60	Salem	2,73
Coimbatore	3,22	Tanjore	2,09
Cuddapah	64	Tinnevely	2,34
Ganjam	98	Trichinopoly	2,03
East Godavari	1,55	Vizagapatam	1,65
West „	71		
Guntur	87	Total	38,32
South Kanara	66		or
Kistna	97		38,32,000
Kurnool	93		

(3) *Municipal Councils.*

	In thousands.		In thousands.
	RS.		RS.
Anantapur	7	Adoni	19
Hindupur	18	Bellary	20
Tadpatri	13	Hospet	11
Gudiyattam	14	Chingleput	22
Tiruppattur	16	Conjeeveram	33
Tiruvannamalai	27	Saidapet	17
Vaniyambadi	10	Chittoor	21
Vellore	46	Tirupati	7
Wallajapet	17	Coimbatore	90
Chidambaram	28	Dharapuram	39
Cuddalore	36	Erode	50
Villupuram	14	Pollachi	1,02

2nd November 1931]

(3) *Municipal Councils*—cont.

In thousands.				In thousands.			
RS.				RS.			
Tiruppur	...	...	55	Palghat	...	...	14
Udamalpet	...	...	46	Tellicherry	...	...	11
Cuddapah	...	...	14	Nellore	...	...	27
Proddatur	...	...	18	Coonoor	...	...	6
Berhampur	...	...	33	Ootacamund	...	...	20
Chicacole	...	...	15	Karaikudi	...	...	67
Parlakimedi	...	...	9	Sivakasi	...	...	13
Cocanada	...	...	35	Srivilliputtur	...	...	18
Peddapuram	...	...	15	Virudhunagar	...	...	29
Rajahmundry	...	...	32	Salem	...	...	95
Chirala	...	...	13	Kumbakonam	...	...	60
Guntur	...	...	50	Mannargudi	...	...	25
Narasaraopet	...	...	15	Mayavaram	...	...	22
Ongole	...	...	6	Negapatam	...	...	23
Tenali	...	...	23	Tanjore	...	...	96
Mangalore	...	...	15	Tiruvavur	...	...	23
Bezwada	...	...	32	Palamcottah	...	...	34
Ellore	...	...	36	Tinnevely	...	...	28
Masulipatam	...	...	23	Tuticorin	...	...	34
Palacole	...	...	30	Srirangam	...	...	11
Kurnool	...	...	23	Karur	...	...	34
Nandyal	...	...	36	Trichinopoly	...	...	58
Bodinayakanur	...	...	15	Anakapalle	...	...	23
Dindigul	...	...	51	Bimlipatam	...	...	8
Kodaikanal	...	...	7	Vizagapatam	...	...	22
Madura	...	...	1,37	Vizianagram	...	...	43
Palni	...	...	27				
Periyakulam	...	...	27				
Calicut	...	...	22				
Cannanore	...	...	7				
Cochin	...	...	5				
				Total ... 23,93			
				or			
				23,93,000			

[2nd November 1931]

APPENDIX VII.

[Vide answer to question No. 524-A asked by Mr. A. B. Shetty at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd November 1931, page 395 supra].

Rates of stipends and stipendiary grants.

Modified rates at which stipends and stipendiary grants should be drawn from October 1931.

Grade and department.

Rates in force till the end of 1930-31.

I. ORDINARY RATES.

	RS.	RS. A. P.
(a) Collegiate department (L.Ts.)	15	9 6 0
(b) Secondary department (S.S.L.C. Juniors)	12	7 3 0
Do. Intermediate Seniors	12	7 6 0
Do. S.S.L.C. (other Seniors)	12	5 4 0
(c) Elementary department, Juniors	8½	5 1 0
Do. Seniors	8½	3 12 0

II. SPECIAL RATES.

(a) College department—		
Masters of Arts	20	12 8 0
Europeans and Masters	36	21 14 0
Anglo-Indians (Mistresses)	25	15 10 0
Muhammadans, Hindu Mistresses, Depressed classes	20	12 8 0

(b) Secondary department—Europeans and Anglo-Indians—

<i>Masters.</i>		
S.S.L.C. Juniors	30	18 0 0
Intermediate Seniors	30	18 8 0
Other Seniors, S.S.L.Cs.	30	13 3 0

Mistresses.

S.S.L.C. Juniors	20	12 0 0
Intermediate (Seniors)	20	12 5 0
Other Seniors, S.S.L.C.	20	8 13 0

Hindu and Muhammadan Mistresses.

S.S.L.C. Juniors and Physical Training Students at the Lady Willingdon Training College	14	8 6 0
Intermediate (Seniors)	14	8 10 0
Other seniors (S.S.L.Cs.)	14	6 2 0

(c) Elementary department—

Higher Elementary Stipendiaries, Muhammadans, Hindu Mistresses, Depressed classes, Juniors. Do. do. Seniors	10½	6 4 0
Do. do. Seniors	10½	4 10 0

Europeans and Anglo-Indians—

Masters { Juniors	25	15 0 0
Seniors	25	11 0 0
Mistresses { Juniors	15	9 0 0
Seniors	15	6 9 0

(d) Enhanced rates for mistresses other than European and Anglo-Indian mistresses, who undergo training elsewhere than in their places of residence.

In force till the end of 1931-32. Modified rates.

	RS.	RS. A. P.
Elementary Grade Juniors	14	8 6 0
Secondary Grade S.S.L.C. Juniors	14	6 2 0
Intermediate Seniors	17½	10 8 0
Other Seniors, S.S.L.Cs.	17½	10 12 0
		7 11 0

2nd November 1931]

APPENDIX VIII.

[Vide Item V "Papers laid on the table of the House" at page 455 supra.]

MEETINGS OF THE RETRENCHMENT COMMITTEE HELD IN
THE CABINET CHAMBER IN THE SECRETARIAT, FORT
ST. GEORGE, ON THE 21ST TO 24TH AND 26TH OCTOBER 1931.

I. Press Communiqué, dated the 21st October 1931.

The Retrenchment Committee resumed their meetings this morning and made recommendations regarding the allowances in one or two departments, the details of which had not been received in time for inclusion at their last meeting in September.

2. The Committee then examined various subsidiary points that had arisen in the course of their previous discussions, including the question of extending the system of fixed travelling allowances and the distribution of fees for X-ray work between Government and the members of the staff. On the latter point they came to the conclusion that a larger proportion of fees should be credited to Government than is the case at present.

3. In the afternoon the Committee commenced a detailed examination of the large question of revising the rates of pay for future entrants to the various Provincial Services. Their examination on this subject will take several days to complete, and they will not be in a position to publish details until they come to final conclusions.

II. Press Communiqué, dated the 22nd October 1931.

The Retrenchment Committee this morning interviewed Major Webb, the Director of Public Health, as regards the possibility of amalgamating the posts of Public Analyst and Chemical Examiner. After hearing his views they decided that amalgamation would be impossible and that no immediate retrenchment could be secured in this way. On the other hand they expressed the view that local men should be trained to take the place eventually of the highly paid officers who perform the duties of these posts at present.

2. They then took up the question of the number of Assistant District Health Officers and Health Inspectors and, after hearing the views of the Director, decided to recommend that the former should be reduced by 6 and the latter by 10.

3. The Committee then examined Mr. Souter, Member of the Board of Revenue, regarding the question of jamabandi allowances. After hearing his views they came to the conclusion that economies of nearly Rs. 1,00,000 could be secured by restricting the number of village menials required to attend jamabandi camps and slightly reducing their allowance.

4. In the afternoon the Committee resumed their investigation of the rates of pay of future entrants to the Provincial Services.

[2nd November 1931]

III. Press Communiqué, dated the 23rd October 1931.

After some further discussion on the question of the revision of pay of future entrants to the Provincial Services, the Committee decided to ask for certain revised proposals to be worked out and to defer further consideration of the question until they had completed the more urgent work of examining the expenditure in a number of important departments with a view to effecting immediate economies.

2. In pursuance of this decision the Committee took up the expenditure of the Excise department. Their discussion had not been concluded by the end of the day.

IV. Press Communiqué, dated the 24th October 1931.

The Committee this morning interviewed Major Howard, the Chief Engineer, Hydro-Electric Development, regarding the scale of expenditure at present incurred on the investigation of hydro-electric projects. They agreed with him that the five-year programme which will end next year should be worked out in full. They understand that when this has been done the Government will be equipped with a number of complete schemes which can be taken up for execution as funds permit and that further expenditure on investigation will be limited to the work on hydro-metric survey which will be necessary for some years to come.

2. The Committee also understand that Government are engaged in working out a scheme for amalgamating under a single head all the electrical activities now performed by the Hydro-Electric Department, the Electrical Inspector and the Electrical Engineer. The Committee agreed that such a scheme should be pursued with the object of co-ordinating the activities of Government and reducing expenditure by the amalgamation of staffs and the carrying out of routine inspections by less expensive agencies than those employed at present. Pending the formulation of a scheme on these lines, which should be expedited as much as possible, they recommended no further measure of retrenchment, except that the appointment of Junior Electrical Inspector to Government, which is now vacant, should continue to be held in abeyance.

3. The Committee also decided to call for a report from the Electrical Inspector showing the extent to which and the scale on which fees are at present levied for consultative work and for carrying out inspections under the Electricity Act, together with proposals for enhancing fees with the object of making the department more self-supporting than it is at present.

4. The Committee concluded their examination of the expenditure of the Excise department. They decided to recommend that the number of Deputy Commissioners should be reduced from 2 to 1, that the number of Assistant Commissioners should be reduced from 10 to 6 and that the experiment, which the Commissioner is now making, of reducing the number of Inspectors in charge of circles and forming sub-circles in charge of Assistant Inspectors, should be extended with the object of limiting the number of Inspectors as soon as possible to the number of

2nd November 1931]

districts. This proposal would entail a reduction of about 40 Inspectors with a corresponding increase in the number of Assistant Inspectors and would result in considerable savings. The Committee also recommended certain reductions in the gazetted staff of the Commissioner's office. So far as the subordinate establishments are concerned, the Committee asked for further information as to the possibility of reducing the temporary staff of Sub-Inspectors, clerks and peons. Under the heading of 'Contingencies,' the Committee considered that a reduction of about 15 per cent might be made in the provision for rewards, clothing and equipment; and expressed the view that rewards should be given with reference to the quality rather than the quantity of the work done, and that they should not be given to the members of the department except in the most important cases. The Committee also considered that Government might examine the question whether it would not be cheaper to give Excise peons a small fixed travelling allowance instead of ordinary travelling allowances. As regards increase of revenue it was suggested that the system of charging fixed fees for petty hotel licences might be exchanged for a system of sale by tender. The Committee further recommended that the distillery selling price of arrack should be examined with reference to the fall in the cost of manufacture with a view to increasing the duty. The Committee also agreed that the system of granting remissions to the renters of shops to compensate them for alleged loss of revenue during the currency of their leases should be stopped.

V. Press communiqué, dated the 26th October 1931.

The Committee took up the expenditure of the Veterinary Department and examined the Director of Veterinary Services. While recommending no decrease in the number of officers in the department the Committee thought that some justifiable economy might be secured by a readjustment of the rates of pay between more important and less important posts.

2. As to establishments the Committee considered that Government should not spend any further money at present on building and opening new dispensaries and that those dispensaries which were not justifying the money that was being spent on them should be closed. New dispensaries in future should be paid for by the local bodies who require them and the question of inviting contributions from local bodies in aid of the existing institutions should also be considered.

3. The expansion of the activities of the department, when this again becomes possible, should be in the direction of appointing more touring assistants, but about one-quarter of the total number employed should be on a temporary footing so that the establishment may be capable of variation with the incidence of cattle disease.

4. Expenditure on the Veterinary College should be reduced by abolishing stipends and creating in their place a limited number of scholarships for students of depressed and backward communities. The ordinary students should also be required to pay fees. As a further means of securing revenue the Committee expressed the opinion that a

[2nd November 1931]

small fee should be levied wherever possible for inoculations performed and recommended that Government should examine this question in consultation with the Director. The main possibility of retrenchment in this department lies in the manufacture of anti-rinderpest serum in Madras instead of buying it from the Government of India. The Committee understood that recent experiments had proved the practicability of this economy and they recommended for the urgent consideration of Government that the manufacture of serum in Madras should be started at the earliest possible date. The Committee are advised that the saving would amount to about Rs. 2 lakhs a year.

5. In the afternoon the Committee examined the Registrar of Co-operative Societies regarding the expenditure of his department. They eventually decided to recommend that the number of Deputy Registrars should be reduced by two and that the grade of Sub-Deputy Registrars should be abolished and replaced by a superior grade of Inspectors. The Committee further agreed that the subsidies now given to District Federations and the Provincial Co-operative Union should be withdrawn, and that three of the six training institutes should cease to receive Government assistance. They also considered that there might be some increase in the number of societies from whom audit fees are collected. Finally they decided to recommend that the Deputy Director of Agriculture who has recently been appointed to work in the Co-operative department should be withdrawn with effect from the beginning of the next financial year and that the present post of Joint Registrar should be abolished.

FORT. ST. GEORGE,
29th October 1931.

G. R. F. TOTTENHAM,
Retrenchment Secretary.

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS